

ber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress.

(Adopted in regular meeting, March 15, 1968.)

Ante *de* *de*
SOVIET PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, 20 years ago the most terrible war ever fought by mankind came to an end. With it there came the hope that religious persecution would forever be banished from the face of the earth. The shocking discovery of the scope of Jewish persecution under Hitler initiated vows by all men never to allow such events to happen again.

These vows were founded on something more than naive idealism, for while such action is against every conceivable code of moral order and decency, it is also a fact that such persecution will bring about the degeneration of a country by excluding from the national life a valuable portion of the intellectual and manpower resources of the country. It has become increasingly evident, however, that the Soviet Union is in the process of throwing these beliefs and hopes against the rocks with all the force its totalitarian strength can bring to bear.

The Soviet Union has extreme methods to hide events in its country that it feels might not be considered in good taste by those outside the Iron Curtain. Yet all of its suppression has not been sufficient to hide its dastardly acts toward its Jewish population. For the past 20 years, free people everywhere have hoped that persecution of religious peoples had ended for all time; yet, at this very instant, the persecution in Russia is looking distressingly similar to the persecution that took place during the Third Reich.

We see the singling out of the Russian Jews for allegations that have no basis whatsoever. As under the tyrannical regime of Hitler, the Jews in the Soviet Union have been singled out as the cause of the country's economic failures.

The propaganda that has been aimed at the Jewish population of the Soviet Union has been of the most vulgar nature, depicting the Jews in the same stereotype that was used by Goebbels, under Hitler, for the vilification of religion and all those who practice it.

There has also been widespread exclusion of the Jews from the same educational, cultural, and employment opportunities that the other Soviet citizens have been offered.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I think the time has come for all good people to unite and, in a voice that will shatter the stone walls of the Kremlin, demand that these practices of persecution, bigotry, and hate be put to an end.

We have before us a concurrent resolution, submitted by the able Senator from Connecticut, that will inform the dictators of the Soviet people of our determination to put a stop to religious persecution in all its forms, wherever it occurs on earth. I have cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 in the belief that the United States has an obligation, as the leader of free peoples, to step forward and condemn these malicious practices.

The resolution is clear in its intent. It states, in brief, that because we steadfastly believe in the freedom of all peoples to practice their religion, without interference of any sort; because the evidence overwhelmingly points to purposely vicious persecution of its Jewish population; and because the Soviet Constitution clearly defends religious freedom; we, therefore, condemn the Soviet Union for its betrayal of the principles of human rights and decency, in the hope that the Soviet Union will restore the rights of the Jews to practice their religion, free from harassment, and to maintain their culture as they have done throughout their history.

At this time, I urge every Senator to support this resolution reaffirming our belief in human rights; I urge all Members of the House of Representatives to join their Senate colleagues in the support of this resolution; and I urge all freedom-loving people the world over to join hands with the American people in asking freedom and dignity for the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union.

LOW UNEMPLOYMENT GOOD NEWS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we are now entering the fifth year of continued improvement in our economy. This is the longest sustained economic expansion in the postwar period. As the employment statistics announced by the Labor Department today show, this fifth year promises to be one of the brightest.

The unemployment figures for the breadwinners of the country have been cut almost in half since the first quarter of 1961. At that point married men had an unemployment rate of 4.8 percent and today it has dropped to 2.6. This is equal to the low level recorded during the 1955-57 expansion period.

The economic growth since March a year ago—1,650,000—has meant jobs for 800,000 more adult men, 700,000 more adult women, and 200,000 more teenagers.

This is truly good news. It demonstrates that bold leadership given the tools to work with can keep the Nation on a prosperity-bound course.

We are indeed "continuing" toward the Great Society President Johnson seeks.

RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING: STAR-SPANGLED ARCHITECTURAL BLUNDER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Members of the Congress apparently are so well aware of the barbarian architectural qualities—if one can use the word "qualities" in this regard—of the third House office building that it is hardly necessary to bring to their attention additional informed judgments. Nevertheless, I think the RECORD should include a recent appraisal of the Rayburn Building by Miss Ada Louise Huxtable, as published in the New York Times of March 30, 1965.

Miss Huxtable concludes her lament about this artless and unbelievably expensive structure with a reference to a saying that "there's no point in crying over spilled marble." But if we should

THE RAYBURN BUILDING: HOUSE OFFICE STRUCTURE IS DESCRIBED AS A DULL, VULGAR, CORRUPT BLUNDER

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

It is moving time on Capitol Hill for 169 Congressmen eligible for space in the new Rayburn House Office Building. The structure's three-room suites complete with refrigerators and safes are being raffled off to applicants who may have a view of the Capitol dome or an interior court, depending on seniority. Even seniority, however, does not give any legislator a door leading from his office, or his aid's office, to his working staff without passage through a waiting room full of constituents and special pleaders. To correct this small planning error would add \$200,000 to costs already estimated at anywhere from \$86 million to \$122 million for the expensive and controversial building.

Some Congressmen are moving in reluctantly. Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio, for one rejected his office on sight. But he is making the move anyway this week because his present quarters are too small.

"This layout could paralyze us," he said during his inspection tour. "It's an ugly building."

Mr. ASHLEY is not alone. The professional architectural press has been bitterly critical as construction progressed. (The building has taken 7 years and \$22 million more to complete than originally estimated largely as the result of expensive miscalculations; change orders have reached 300 percent over Government average; bid estimates on contracts have been as much as \$45 million off.)

There have been accusations of secret planning, pork barrel commissions and possible misuse of public funds. The fact that the general contractor was Matthew J. McCloskey, Democratic Party stalwart of Philadelphia, has not escaped notice. But the storm swirls uselessly around a behemoth that is obviously here to stay.

DEFECTS ARE NUMEROUS

Architecturally, the Rayburn Building is a national disaster. Its defects range from profligate mishandling of 50 acres of space to elephantine esthetic banality at record costs. The costs are now being investigated by the General Accounting Office.

Equal to the question of costs, however, is the question of what Congress and the capital have received for the investment. It is quite possible that this is the worst building for the most money in the history of the construction art. It stuns by sheer mass and boring bulk. Only 15 percent of its space is devoted to the offices and hearing rooms for which it was erected.

Forty-two percent of the floor area is used for parking. Endless corridors have been likened to "Last Year at Marienbad." Stylistically, it is the apotheosis of humdrum.

It is hard to label the building, but it might be called Corrupt Classic. Its empty aridity and degraded classical details are vulgarization without drama, and to be both dull and vulgar may be an achievement of sorts.

The structure's chief design features are hollow exercises in sham grandeur. A supercolossal exterior expanse of stolid, Mussolini-style pomp is embellished with sculpture that would be the apogee of art in the Soviet Union, where overscaled muscles and ex-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6387

for strict economy; (2) the appropriate officers of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress. (Unanimously adopted in regular meeting, Mar. 15, 1965.)

RESOLUTION OF THE RICHARDSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS RE AMENDING TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Whereas it has been and is an American precept that man is a being with a free will, so endowed by his Creator; and

Whereas the system of free enterprise is peculiarly and especially a cherished American tradition, applying alike to the business enterprise and to the individual, to the employee, and to the employer; and

Whereas expressions of these propositions are included in many acts of social legislation; they are particularly emphasized, for example, in the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964:

"Sec. 703(a). It shall be unlawful employment practice for an employer—(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."

Whereas these propositions are a fundamental part of the laws of Texas, as seen in sections 1 and 2 of article 5207a of Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes of Texas, which was enacted in 1947 by the Legislature of the State of Texas in reliance upon section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, 29 U.S.C. 164(b)).

Taft-Hartley Act, section 14(b): "Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

Article 5207a, Vernon's Annotated Texas Civil Statutes:

"Section 1. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.

"Sec. 2. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or non-membership in a labor union."; and

Whereas there now are before the Congress of the United States proposals aimed at repealing 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, quoted in part hereinabove, so that laws of this State of Texas guaranteeing to individuals the right of free determination whether to join or refrain from joining a labor union, would be preempted: Therefore be it

Resolved, (1) The Richardson Chamber of Commerce opposes the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, quoted above; (2) the appropriate officers of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas members of the U.S. Congress.

(Unanimously adopted in regular meeting Mar. 15, 1965.)

RESOLUTION OF THE RICHARDSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS RE ADEQUATE HEALTH CARE FOR ELDER CITIZENS

The provision and the utilization of adequate health services to citizens above 65 years of age is a matter of interest and concern to all public spirited citizens.

Studies, including the 1963 Report of the President's Council on Aging, indicate that elderly citizens as a group meet their costs of living, including health care, much better

than the younger ages and enjoy remarkably good health for the most part. Over sixty percent of the 18 million elderly in the United States carry some form of voluntary prepayment health insurance; 72 percent of Texas' elderly citizens are so covered.

Yet many citizens do need additional aid such as those on old age assistance, or others who become really burdened in meeting the costs of an unexpected or major illness. Those who need assistance and only those, can get it under the Kerr-Mills Law passed in 1960. We in Texas amended our constitution in November 1964, so as to increase the benefits obtainable under this 1960 law, by those needy and elderly in Texas. Governor Connally stated in his annual message to the Texas Legislature in January 1965, that he favors this solution of the problem. It gives aid only to those in need whereas the social security approach assures aid to all employed, when they become ill in elder years, regardless of need and at much greater cost to all.

On January 27, 1965, Congressman HERLONG and Congressman CURTIS introduced identical bill, H. R. 3727 and H.R. 3728 known as the Eldercare Act of 1965. Aid to those in need under the Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965, would consist of medical, surgical, dental, hospital, nursing home, and drug benefits rather than being limited to hospital and nursing home care. State and Federal funds would be provided on a sliding scale basis, to persons aged 65 or older who are in need, as defined by their incomes, the defining limits being set by the individual States. Recipients would obtain policies providing a wide spectrum of medical, surgical, and hospital benefits from health insurance companies or from Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans. Under the proposal an individual would pay all, part, or none of the cost of the policy, depending upon his total income. Individuals whose incomes are under specified minimums would have the entire cost of the policy paid by the State agency that would administer the program. Eligibility for benefits would be determined solely by use of a simple information return in which the applicant would list his income from all sources.

The Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 would thus maintain the basic principles that persons 65 years or older who need help in paying for health care should receive help, but only they; that maximum responsibility and authority for providing such help should be retained by the States; and that funds from the Federal source should be from general tax revenues; and that voluntary health insurance and prepayment principles should be utilized whenever possible.

All this is in sharp contrast with the proposed King-Anderson principle of a compulsory health insurance plan whereby social security taxes or payroll taxes on all ages of working citizens would provide certain limited hospital and nursing home benefits to the elderly.

Meanwhile, the provisions of the Kerr-Mills law have been accepted to greater or lesser degree by approximately 45 States and territories. There have been inequities and difficulties, but such problems existing in some States can be rapidly overcome. In Texas, our legislature is expected to provide quickly for those elderly citizens in need of further assistance by legislation under the Kerr-Mills Act; Therefore, be it

Resolved, (1) The Richardson Chamber of Commerce favors the enactment by Congress of the Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 and by the legislature of Texas of legislation implementing assistance to the elderly in Texas in need, under the Kerr-Mills Act; and opposes the pending King-Anderson bill in Congress or other like measures; (2) the appropriate officers of the Richardson Cham-

March 20

ations in the House and gives me an opportunity to see how the leadership works." Steve Lesher decided to work for BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, because "I wanted a bright, young, liberal Democrat. I wanted a spot where I had the freedom to walk into the Senator's office whenever I wanted to and where I would be permitted to do a variety of things."

Lesher likes the job because "You can do things. You can really influence things. I am contributing significantly in working on the question of presidential disability to what may be the 25th amendment to the Constitution."

SPEAKS FOR SENATOR

He says that swapping the byline of a reporter for the relative anonymity of a staff job is not too difficult. "I have carte blanche to speak for the Senator," he says, "so what I say carries weight with a lot of weighty people. That can fill your ego just like seeing your name in print."

Mr. Lesher says that the problem for a newsman-fellow is that "you have to decide whether you want to be a Scotty Reston and believe that 'the truth shall set you free' or whether you want to put up with the facade and nonsense that politics requires but where you are in a position to do things." He adds that the monetary aspect—a staffworker in a Hill office can earn two or three times as much as most good reporters—often draws good men away from journalism.

Most of the newsmen came to Washington with a critical attitude toward the Congress. For many, their views have been changed completely.

"I have found things here completely different from the way I expected," says Neal Gregory, who is in the office of Representative CHARLES WELTNER. "I have become more conservative in my views. I think that in the area of civil rights, many people are more interested in the issue than in getting a bill through Congress. Senator HUMPHREY once said his worst problem is with the liberals. He's a pragmatic liberal, which is the only way to be."

Eliot Carlson says, "I've seen how little the reformers understand the workings of Congress. The big problem as I see it is a lack of liberals, not the need for drastic reforms."

LEARNS TO RESPECT A VIEW

"I came here a big liberal," says Steve Lesher. "I thought HOWARD SMITH (chairman of the House Rules Committee) had horns. But I have come to respect the southern Democrats. I'd rather have a man like WILLIAM FULBRIGHT signing the southern manifesto and staying in Congress than not signing it and getting beaten. The Congressman has to be responsive to the views of the people in his district. If he isn't, who is?"

Roger Blobaum says, "I came here very concerned about freedom of information in Government. I have found that in Congress this problem is not as important as I thought. There is a great deal of off-the-record briefing here. I also didn't like the idea of holding executive sessions, but when I see how complex these bills are and the importance of compromise, I've become convinced that these sessions are necessary."

Mr. Blobaum says that he has heard the debate about the evils of the seniority system, but asks "What are the alternatives? You are going to have problems with any system."

John Heritage says that "my whole idea of the kind of people in District of Columbia has changed. I have discovered that most people in responsible positions here are sincere, articulate, and sophisticated about most subjects. Many are political experts as well as votegivers. When you are looking in from outside, much of what you read about Congress is critical. When you

get close and see the problems Congressmen have in time and the amount of information they have to absorb, you can see how Congress has a hard time running smoothly sometimes."

EYES ON PRESS CORPS

The fellows have also watched—with a critical eye—the way the press corps covers congressional issues. The main complaint is that congressional issues often get only superficial treatment.

"I am personally not satisfied with the kind of coverage you get out of Washington," says Steven Lesher. "When you just read the wire stories about some of the big issues, I have found that you only get a vague idea of what is going on. The press tends to picture congressional debates in terms of black and white, which is easy to do but doesn't give an accurate picture."

"I have talked to a number of Washington officials who were very critical of the kind of reporting they are getting," says John Heritage. "They felt that many reporters didn't understand what was going on sometimes, and that the result was distortion out of ignorance. I think that the way reporters are spread around you can't expect more than superficial coverage."

Neal Gregory adds, "As a newspaperman, you like to seize on a lead. But there are very few yes-and-no values or black-and-white issues—but many areas of gray. I think the main problem is that much reporting is lacking in depth. I don't think that this is always the reporter's fault. Most newspapers don't have enough space to cover Washington adequately."

MEN OF EXPERIENCE

Each of the fellows has had from 2 to 10 years' experience in the newspaper field, and they feel qualified to comment on the performance of the press. They range in age from 25 to 33, and most of them took leaves of absence from their newspapers to take part in the program.

The criteria for selecting the fellows are flexible, according to Donald Tacheron, director of the program and a former newsman and fellow. The association prefers newsmen or women in the age bracket of from 25 to 35 who have had at least 2 years of experience on a daily newspaper. Mr. Tacheron says that most of the fellows go back into the newspaper field after their stint on the Hill, and find that their Washington experience is a great help professionally.

The newspapers whose reporters win the fellowships are usually enthusiastic, Mr. Tacheron says. A number of papers not only give leaves of absence but grant stipends as well. The New York Times Fund, the Louisville Courier Journal Fund, Time, Inc., and Nelson Poynter, publisher of the St. Petersburg Times and the Congressional Quarterly are among the contributors to the program.

CURRENT CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWS AND THE OFFICES TO WHICH THEY ARE ATTACHED

Shamsuddin Ahmed, House Rules Committee.

Stanley V. Anderson, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin.

Richard E. Ashcraft, Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri.

Robert H. Bendt, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Roger J. Blobaum, House majority whip's office.

Clifford H. Block, Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr., of California.

Elliot W. Carlson, Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho.

Richard P. Conlon, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey.

Bartolome deCastro, Representative RONALD B. CAMERON, of California.

Lewis A. (Creel) Froman, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Daniel W. Fulmer, Subcommittee on Military Operations, House Government Operations Committee.

Irwin H. Gertzog, Representative LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, of California.

Wayne G. Granquist, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana.

C. O. (Neal) Gregory, Representative CHARLES L. WELTNER, of Georgia.

Nelson P. Gull, Representative JAMES G. O'HARA, of Michigan.

Mohammed Hakki, Representative DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota.

John M. Heritage, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York.

Wallace E. Hutton, Representative CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma.

William G. Kaglier, Senator ABRAHAM REICOFF, of Connecticut.

Chin Kim, Senate Judiciary Committee.

Stephen Lesher, Senator BIRCH E. BAYH, of Indiana.

Robert D. Loevy, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California.

Edward A. Mainland, Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California.

John F. Manley, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri.

Lyle L. Miller, Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, of New York.

John N. Shoultz, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Narayan D. Tiwari, Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii.

Sadanand S. Varde, Representative JOHN KYL, of Iowa.

Marvin G. Weinbaum, Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana.

PROPOSED ORDER FOR RECESS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock Monday morning.

MR. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not know that the Senator from Mississippi will object—will the Senator withhold his request until I can check?

MR. MANSFIELD. Certainly. I withhold the request.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

MR. McGOVERN. Mr. President, senior Senator from New Mexico [MR. ANDERSON] delivered an excellent address last night at the New Mexico State University Water Conference on the needs for expanded research in the water resources field.

Senator ANDERSON pointed out that the seemingly considerable sum we are spending for research in the field of water problems—\$73 millions annually—is actually inadequate measured by the diversity of water problems throughout this large Nation, measured by the crucial importance of water conservation and supply, or measured by sums devoted to research in other fields. It is about seven-tenths of 1 percent of our current \$10 billion annual outlay for water facilities of various kinds compared to 3 percent spent by the oil and gas industry on research, 6 percent spent by the chemical industry and 12½ percent spent by the automotive industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator ANDERSON's address be printed in the RECORD, for it is a splendid statement of the merits of S. 2, which would draw our colleges and universities

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5587

built and equipped and the added capacity is put to use, General Motors anticipates an increase of about 50,000 jobs nationwide.

Mr. President, this is an outstanding example of how American private enterprise is coping with highly competitive conditions by plowing huge capital outlays into research and engineering development and the modernization of plant and equipment. These outlays today will insure the quantity and quality production in future years to meet an ever-expanding demand for automotive products. And within the context of a strong profit system, investment in income-producing assets today will mean generation of tomorrow's profits to sustain continuation of the cycle of investment and expansion required of all segments of our economy if we are to obtain maximum employment opportunities for all Americans.

As announced by Mr. Donner, General Motors will undertake substantial facilities programs at various locations in the United States by all five General Motors car divisions and by a number of divisions that supply parts and accessories to the car manufacturing and assembly divisions. I am delighted that three of these facilities programs will be undertaken in the State of New York: the first, entailing construction of an additional 216,000 square feet of floor space at the Ternstedt Division at Syracuse, N.Y., which manufactures certain plastic parts, wheel discs and zinc-based die-cast parts; next, construction of a 171,000-square-foot addition to the Chevrolet Motor Division's engine plant at Tonawanda, N.Y.; and finally, a one-story addition of 150,000 square feet of manufacturing area, plus the installation of new boiler house equipment, at the West Lockport plant of the Harrison Radiator Division of General Motors.

These three expansion projects, Mr. President, in my judgment, represent a vote of confidence by the respective divisions of General Motors in the industry and skills of the labor force in these three fine manufacturing cities in New York State. It is a vote of confidence, I am sure, which the employees, both those presently employed and those who will be employed in new jobs, will vindicate. It is also a tribute to the improving industrial climate in New York State, a favorable climate which has been generated by the educational and training systems in which New York leads the Nation and the progressive labor protective laws which foster that high degree of employee welfare and security which enhance their production efforts.

I am sure that Senators from other States entertain like gratification for those portions of the facilities program of General Motors that are located in their States. But whatever may be the effect of the expansion program upon particular States, the important thing is that the program is one that fosters an overriding national interest in a strong, productive, and growing economy, enabling us to go out into today's marketplace and confer upon this Nation and other nations in the free world the

great material abundance that characterizes free economic systems.

REPORTERS ACCLAIM CAPITOL EXPERIENCE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the members of the working press have a great responsibility: To inform and interpret, in accurate and fair-minded fashion, with the public interest ever in mind. Since 1953, the American Political Science Association has sponsored a program uniquely designed to furnish newspapermen with knowledge necessary to meet this responsibility when reporting congressional affairs.

The congressional fellowship program includes a select group of newsmen who spend 9 months on Capitol Hill, functioning as members of office and committee staffs. They carry out regular office duties, and soon are immersed in the legislative process. They are able to examine firsthand the numerous forces and considerations that shape our country's laws.

To date, more than 100 men and women have taken part in the congressional fellowship program. Half of them have been professional newspaper people. The other participants have been political scientists from our colleges and universities and, in recent years, representatives of the executive branch of the Federal Government and several foreign nations.

A program this broad is of immense value to the Congress. Shortly after I came to the Senate, I was fortunate to have a congressional fellow join my staff.

Tom King came to my office from the Atomic Energy Commission and was of great help in the planning and initiation of the pesticide hearings I have been conducting. He has since returned to the AEC. Currently serving in my office is Bill Kagler, a most able reporter from the Cincinnati Enquirer, who I am sure will have a most successful career in journalism.

I am pleased to have been able to afford them an opportunity for professional growth, and simultaneously to have contributed to their understanding of the role of Congress in Government.

The March 14 issue of *Editor & Publisher*, the trade journal of the publishing industry, contains an article describing the reactions of current journalistic participants to their congressional experience. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD with a list of all 1963-64 congressional fellows and the offices to which they are attached.

There being no objection, the article and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTERS ACCLAIM CAPITOL EXPERIENCE

(By Caryl Rivers)

WASHINGTON.—Seven newspapermen have stored their notepads in mothballs and are learning how the other half lives.

They are spending 9 months working on Capitol Hill through the congressional fellowship program of the American Political Science Association.

The program—largely financed by the Ford Foundation—has been operating since 1953. This year, 14 fellows, including the news-

men and 7 political scientists, were selected for the \$4,500 grant that accompanies the fellowship.

The fellows work in staff positions in House or Senate offices. They can choose to divide their time between both Houses, or remain in one office for the duration of their stay. The legislators, often hard-pressed for staff workers, are delighted to get an extra worker without making a dent in their office payroll.

MEMBERS OF THE GROUP

This year's fellows from the ranks of the press corps are Bill Kagler, of the Cincinnati Enquirer; Steve Lesher, of the Winston-Salem Journal; Roger Blobaum, of the Associated Press; Eliot Carlson, of the Honolulu Advertiser; Richard Conlon, of the Minneapolis Tribune; Neal Gregory, of the Memphis Commercial Appeal; and John Heritage, of the Atlanta Constitution.

The group arrived in Washington in November, and after a 2-month orientation period the fellows plunged into their jobs on the Hill. They often find themselves doing routine chores like helping with the mail and high-level tasks like writing speeches for their boss in the course of a single day.

Steve Lesher, in Senator BIRCH BAYH's office, is working on an article for the Senator for a national magazine on the problem of presidential disability and succession. He is also arranging to get witnesses for a congressional hearing on the problem.

Richard Conlon, working for Representative FRANK THOMPSON, coordinated the whip system in the House during the vote on the civil rights bill.

Eliot Carlson is handling "the whole spectrum of office problems" for Senator FRANK CHURCH, from "routine tasks to high-powered projects."

Most of the newsmen who win the fellowships return to the field after they leave Capitol Hill. But they think that their leave of absence from journalism makes them better journalists.

"When you've been part of the system, you're more sensitive to why it may or may not work," says Bill Kagler, a staffer in the office of Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF. "So much of what goes across an editor's desk today involves the Federal Government—even in the 'boondocks.' As an editor you are a lot more equipped to provide leadership if you understand the workings of the Government. More and more papers are going into intensive reporting in the area of government."

Mr. Kagler found that after coming to Washington, he had to make a mental switch from the objectivity of a newsmen to the necessity for being subjective. He thinks the fellowship is a good opportunity "to find out if I can function in a government climate or if I was born to be a newsmen."

Eliot Carlson admits to a "passion for politics" and says "the big need in journalism is for writers able to go in depth. A journalist has to present more than just facts. He has to write in greater depth about the political process."

AREAS OF INTEREST

The fellows decided for themselves what offices they wanted to work in, and they offer a variety of reasons for their choices.

"I am interested in the South" says John Heritage, who works for Congressman JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, "but I wanted to get an idea of what a Northern politician is like and how a Northern liberal feels. LINDSAY is young, energetic, and I think he's right courageous. They call him a minority in a minority but I think most of his stands are reasonable."

Rober Blobaum picked a spot in the office of House Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, because it is "the real center of oper-

March 20

Mr. Ralph Bellamy, Actor; Mr. Saul Bellow, Novelist; Dr. James H. Billington, Professor of History, Princeton University; Miss Patricia Blake, Writer; Dr. Sarah Gibson Blanding, President, Vassar College; Mr. Irving Brown, United Nations Representative, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Director, Research Institute on Communist Affairs, Columbia University; Dr. F. Byrnes, Chairman, Department of History, Indiana University.

Mr. James B. Carey, President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers; Dr. Lawrence H. Chamberlain, Vice President, Columbia University; Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, Professor of Psychology, City College of New York; Dr. Lewis A. Coser, Professor of Sociology, Brandeis University; Mr. Norman Cousins, Editor, Saturday Review.

Dr. Henry David, former President, New School for Social Research; Dr. William C. Davison, Associate Professor of Physics, Haverford College; Dr. Herbert A. Deane, Professor of Government, Columbia University; Dr. Fred W. Dupee, Professor of English Literature, Columbia University.

Dr. Samuel Eilenberg, Professor of Mathematics, Columbia University; Mr. Ralph Ellison, Novelist; Dr. Thomas I. Emerson, Lines Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Dr. Alexander Erlich, Associate Professor of Economics, Columbia University; Dr. Victor Erlich, Bensington Professor of Russian Literature, Yale University.

Dr. Merle Fainsod, Director, Russian Research Center, Harvard University; Professor of Government, Harvard University; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews; Mr. James Farmer, National Director, Congress of Racial Equality; Dr. Lewis S. Feuer, Professor of Philosophy, University of California; Mr. Louis Fischer, School of Politics, Princeton University; Rev. George B. Ford, Pastor Emeritus, Corpus Christi Church; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Minister Emeritus, Riverside Church; Dr. James Franck, Nobel Prize Laureate in Physics, 1925; Professor of Chemistry, University of Pittsburgh; Dr. Charles Frankel, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University; Mr. Seymour Freidin, Executive Editor, Foreign News, New York Herald Tribune; Dr. Maurice Friedberg, Professor of Russian Literature, Hunter College.

Mr. Oscar Gass, Economic Consultant; Mr. Mark Gayn, Political Analyst, Toronto Star; Dr. Leo Gershey, Professor of History, New York University; Mr. Robert W. Gilmore, Executive Director, Turn Toward Peace; Dr. Eli Ginzberg, Professor of Economics, Columbia University; Director, Conservation of Human Resources Project; Mr. B. Z. Goldberg, Journalist; Mr. Erich Goldhagen, Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Hunter College; Dr. Marshall I. Goldman, Associate Professor of Economics, Wellesley College; Dr. William E. Griffith, Research Associate, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Leo Grulow, Editor, Current Digest of the Soviet Press.

Dr. Louis M. Hacker, Professor of Economics, Columbia University; Dr. Fowler Harper, Simeon E. Baldwin Professor of Law, Yale University; Rev. Donald S. Harrington, Minister, the Community Church of New York; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, President, Uni-

versity of Notre Dame; Mr. William J. vanden Heuvel, President, International Rescue Committee; Mr. Granville Hicks, Literary Critic; Mr. Herbert Hill, Labor Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mr. Maurice Hindus, Author and Journalist; Dr. Irving Howe, Professor of English Literature, Hunter College; Editor, Dissent, a Socialist Quarterly; Rev. Blahoslav S. Hrubý, Associate Editor Religion in Communist Dominated Areas; Dr. H. Stuart Hughes, Professor of History, Harvard University; Cochairman, Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Dr. Alex Inkeles, Professor of Sociology, Harvard University; Dr. Homer A. Jack, Executive Director, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Dr. Norman Jacobs, Director of Publications, Foreign Policy Association; Mr. Julius Jacobson, Editor, New Politics, a Socialist Quarterly; Dr. Peter Juviler, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Hunter College.

Dr. Arcadius Kahan, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Chicago; Dr. Horace M. Kallen, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, New School for Social Research; Dr. Abraham Kaplan, Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan; Mr. Alfred Kazin, Literary Critic; Mr. H. L. Keenlyside, Chairman, British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority; Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews; Mr. Stanley Kunitz, Poet.

Mr. Arthur Larson, Director, World Rule of Law Center, School of Law, Duke University; Mr. Joseph P. Lash, U.N. Editor, the New York Post; Dr. Abba P. Lerner, Professor of Economics, Michigan State University; Dr. Daniel Lerner, Director, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Professor of Sociology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Edward Q. Lewis, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Dr. C. Eric Lincoln, Professor of Social Relations, Clark College; Dr. Leon Lipson, Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Mr. Robert Lowell, Poet; Rev. John A. Lucal, S.J., Associate Editor, America.

Dr. Dwight Macdonald, Writer; Dr. Robert M. MacIver, President, New School for Social Research; Mr. Archibald MacLeish, Poet, Playwright; Mr. Bernard Malamud, Novelist; Dr. Jacques Maritain, Professor Emeritus, Princeton University; Former French Ambassador to the Vatican; Dr. Rufus W. Mathewson, Jr., Associate Professor of Russian Language and Literature, Columbia University; Mr. B. F. McLaurin, Vice President, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; Dr. Seymour Melman, Professor of Industrial Engineering, Columbia University; Mr. Arthur Miller, Playwright; Dr. Ashley Montagu, Anthropologist; Miss Marianne Moore, Poet; Mr. Edward P. Morgan, Political Commentator; Dr. Hermann J. Muller, Nobel Prize Laureate in Medicine and Physiology, 1946; Professor of Zoology, Indiana University; Dr. A. J. Muste, Editor, Liberation Magazine; Secretary Emeritus, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Dr. Ernest Nagel, John Dewey Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University; Dr. Jerome Nathanson, Member of Board of Leaders, The Society for Ethical Culture; Dr. Henry Neumann, Member, Board of Leaders, The Society for Ethical Culture.

Mr. William S. Paley, Chairman of the Board, Columbia Broadcasting System; Dr. Jan Papanek, Vice Chairman, International League for the Rights of Man; Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, Episcopal Bishop of California; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews.

Dr. Eugene Rabinowitch, Editor, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews; Mr. Alan Reitman, Associate Director, American Civil Liberties Union; Mr. Walter Reuther, President, United Automobile Workers of America; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews; Dr. David Riesman, Henry Ford II Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard University; Dr. John P. Roche, Morris Hillquit Professor of Labor and Social Thought, Brandeis University; Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; Mr. Harold Rosenberg, Art and Social Critic; Dr. Alvin Z. Rubinstein, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. J. B. Salsberg, Writer; Mr. Maurice Samuel, Writer; Dr. Meyer Schapiro, Professor of Art History, Columbia University; Mr. James H. Scheuer, Former President, Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York City; Dr. Benjamin I. Schwartz, Professor of Government, Harvard University; Mr. Max Shachtman, Socialist Leader; Historian; Dr. Samuel L. Sharp, Professor of International Relations, the American University; Mr. Howard K. Smith, Political Commentator; Dr. Gene Sosin, Director of New York Bureau, Radio Liberty; Mr. I. F. Stone, editor, I. F. Stone's Weekly; Mr. Rex Stout, Writer; Miss Marie Syrkin, Associate Professor of Humanities, Brandeis University.

Dr. Telford Taylor, Professor of Law, Columbia University; Mr. Norman Thomas, Socialist and Peace Leader; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews; Dr. Lionel Trilling, Professor of English, Columbia University; Dr. Melvin Tumin, Professor of Sociology, Princeton University.

Mr. Robert Penn Warren, Novelist and Poet; Sponsor, Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews; Dr. Herbert Wechsler, Harlan Fiske Stone Professor of Constitutional Law, Columbia Law School; Dr. Morton White, Professor of Philosophy, Harvard University; Mr. Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mr. David C. Williams, Former National Director, Americans for Democratic Action (ADA); Mr. Edward Bennett Williams, Attorney; Dr. Avraham Yarmolinsky, Former Chief, Slavic Division, New York Public Library.

GENERAL MOTORS EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week Mr. Frederic G. Donner, chairman of the board of General Motors Corp., made public General Motors' capital spending plans for plants and equipment for the years 1964 and 1965.

In dollars and cents terms, it was revealed that General Motors' program will entail capital expenditures over the 2-year period of almost \$2 billion, the largest for any such period in its entire history. Mr. Donner is quoted as having said that when the projected plants are

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Anti-Soviet
5585

editor and manager of news, flew back to California yesterday, a big Washington figure no more. Mr. Salinger, who resigned as President Johnson's news secretary for the uncertain future of a California Senate campaign, left behind him a host of friends, a host of critics, a lot of questions, and an equally place at the luncheon table at Sans Souci, a French restaurant of local repute.

No one knew for sure why Mr. Salinger and President Johnson had come to a parting of the ways, but the departure of the portly, cigarpuffing news secretary with his spectacular vests, informal manner, and flair for the headlines, was one more indication that the Washington of John F. Kennedy's day was slowly, surely disappearing.

Few Government officials were more closely identified with Mr. Kennedy than was Mr. Salinger. It was he at whom Mr. Kennedy aimed his quips during the 50-mile hike craze. It was Mr. Salinger who drank milk at a news conference when Mr. Kennedy tried to assure the public against a radiation scare (and it was the correspondents, who knew the news secretary's real habits, who gave him a bottle of wine in compensation).

DRIVE HIT CLUBHOUSE

It was "Lucky Pierre," as some of his poker and golf companions call him, who earned fame for hitting the clubhouse with his drive when he and Mr. Kennedy played golf at the Hyannis Port Country Club last summer.

Mr. Salinger once held a news conference around a piano at a Hyannis Port restaurant, and played tennis at the staid Newport Casino in a yellow shirt and blue shorts—or vice versa. He appeared in party hats in his White House office, smoked cigars of Churchillian length, and probably threw more raises into more poker pots than any White House habitue since Warren G. Harding.

For all his colorful ways and what reporters thought was a masterly inattention to detail, Mr. Salinger helped effect profound changes in presidential press relations. He put Mr. Kennedy on live television for news conferences, and that had never been done before. And he helped arrange Mr. Kennedy's unusual interview with Aleksai I. Adzhubol, the son-in-law of Premier Khrushchev.

When Mr. Johnson took office, Mr. Salinger was a guiding spirit in the impromptu news conferences the new President held in his office and over a bale of hay at the L.B.J. Ranch.

STRESS ON TELEVISION

He came within an inch of arranging an exchange of television appearances in the Soviet Union and the United States for Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev, and he put more emphasis on live television than any press secretary ever had—Mr. Kennedy's and Mr. Johnson's nationally televised interviews with network correspondents, for instance.

Reporters who worked with Pierre Salinger day by day viewed him as convivial, talented and dedicated to Mr. Kennedy, but none too devoted to the interests of the press. Few accused him of underhanded dealings; but even fewer believed he lived up to his own ideal of being a reporter for the press, a man who would provide other reporters with straight news of the President's activities.

Mr. Salinger came to the White House staff by way of an investigating reporter on the San Francisco Chronicle, the old Collier's magazine and services as an investigator on the Senate committee that investigated labor racketeering. Robert F. Kennedy was counsel and Senator John F. Kennedy was a member of the committee.

When Mr. Johnson took office last November Mr. Salinger seemed to have adjusted to the Texan's new ways better than any other

member of the Kennedy staff. But within weeks of the new President's swearing in, there were rumors that neither man was entirely happy in the relationship.

Mr. Salinger was born in San Francisco, January 14, 1925. He has been married to the former Nancy Joy of Spokane, Wash. He has three children.

Mr. Salinger's past includes period as a child pianist of prodigious ability. His future is unknown, California being a State the politics of which are extremely difficult to predict.

As he leaves Washington, those who knew him here have mixed reactions. There are few who will not concede that working with him was usually fun, frequently exciting, and sometimes delightful. Nobody ever accused Pierre Salinger of being a bore.

TWENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the first day of this month recalled tragic memories of the merciless slaughter of the cream of Polish youth at Katyn Forest 24 years ago. The New York Division of the Polish-American Congress has adopted a resolution requesting that the Secretary of State transfer the documents of the congressional investigation into this horrible event to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I entirely support this effort to publicize the barbaric acts of the NKVD.

I request unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks this resolution be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT COMMEMORATIVE EXERCISES OF THE DOWNTOWN NEW YORK DIVISION OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS, SUNDAY, MARCH 1, 1964, AT THE POLISH NATIONAL HOME IN NEW YORK CITY

Assembled on this 24th anniversary of the massacre of nearly 5,000 Polish Army Officers by Soviet NKVD agents in the Katyn woods near Smolensk, Russia, we, Americans of Polish birth or origin, resolve as follows:

Whereas the people of Poland are unable to express their true sentiments regarding the Katyn massacre; and

Whereas the guilt for the said massacre has been duly established by a Special Congressional Katyn Committee under the chairmanship of Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana; and

Whereas a congressional resolution to have the voluminous documentary data of the said Special Katyn Committee transmitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations—was never carried out; and

Whereas previously, the Nuremberg War Crimes' Tribunal failed to convict the said NKVD culprits in the Katyn massacre, as were some Nazi war criminals: therefore

We respectfully petition the Secretary of State of the United States to order the transmission of the aforesaid Katyn documents to the General Assembly of the United Nations for proper action; and

We also entreat the Secretary of State to consider the grave dangers to our national security implicit in some phases of the execution of the present cultural exchange program with the U.S.S.R.

IGNATIUS MORAWSKI,
Chairman Resolution Committee.
FRANCIS J. PROCH,
Executive Vice President.

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE FOR THE JEWS OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am honored to join in a most significant appeal for religious freedom and an end to discrimination and persecution of members of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union. This appeal, signed by prominent authorities on Soviet political life, as well as religious leaders, authors, union leaders, educators, and attorneys, should serve an important purpose in arousing the people of this Nation and the world as to the extent of the Soviet repression of Jewish cultural and religious practices. It deserves the endorsement of national leaders in all fields as part of an all-out effort to apply pressure on the Soviet Government and to make known the dismay and revulsion with which the civilized world looks on Soviet behavior toward Jewish life and traditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a document entitled "An Appeal to Conscience for the Jews of the Soviet Union." It is a very moving document, and points out the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL OF CONSCIENCE FOR THE JEWS OF THE SOVIET UNION

We appeal to all those in the U.S.S.R. who genuinely desire the eradication of the evils of Stalinism and who, with us, thirst for truth, justice, and decency.

We appeal to the Soviet authorities to act in this matter on the basis of their own ideological, constitutional, and legal commitments.

We fervently hope that the following specific steps may be taken:

1. Jewish education in all its forms should be permitted.

2. Jewish cultural institutions should be reopened and Jewish artistic life—literature, theater, music, in Yiddish and Hebrew—should be allowed to develop fully.

3. Central institutions to serve the religious needs of Soviet Jewry should be established; obstacles to the performance of sacred rites should be removed.

4. Formal religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad should be allowed, official exchange visits permitted, and the right to make religious pilgrimages to the Holy Land granted.

5. Permission for Jews to leave the U.S.S.R., so that they may be reunited with families in other lands from whom they have been separated, should be implemented.

6. The anti-Jewish character that so strongly colors the official campaign against economic crimes should be eliminated.

7. A vigorous educational campaign against anti-Semitism should be undertaken.

We issue this appeal in all solemnity as a matter of urgency and elementary decency. We cannot keep silent so long as justice is not done on this problem.

Dr. Stringfellow Barr, Professor of Humanities, Rutgers University; Dr. Markus Barth, Professor of Theology, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary; Mr. Paul Barton, Chief, Economic and Social Affairs, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; Dr. Raymond A. Bauer, Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University;

I have also had reports from other sources about the seriousness of the situation and about the need for emergency action to make it possible for the Jewish people in the Soviet Union to observe the Feast of the Passover.

I ask unanimous consent that the news report in the New York Times be printed in the RECORD, along with the text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and article will be printed in the RECORD, and the joint resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 164) calling upon the President of the United States to use full facilities of our Government to make arrangements for and to bring about delivery of an adequate supply of matzoth to key centers of Jewish life in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on an emergency basis, so that the feast of the Passover which begins at sundown Friday, March 27, and ends at sundown Saturday, April 4, may be observed in keeping with 5,724 years of Jewish tradition introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas religious liberty is one of the most cherished rights of American democracy, and

Whereas the securing and protection of religious liberty is a desired objective of the United Nations, and

Whereas the limitation or denial of religious liberty to one religious group or sect by any member of the United Nations is a threat to the liberty of all religious groups and sects, and

Whereas the studied practice of religious discrimination or persecution by any permanent member of the United Nations Security Council does violence to the charter of that organization and gives rise to a serious threat to peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of Congress that the cause of peace with justice is served by calling upon the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and the membership of the Council of Nationalities of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to cause an immediate cessation of all measures which deny to members of the Jewish faith the free, devotional, and historic observance of the Feast of the Passover; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to use the full facilities of our Government to make arrangements for and to bring about the delivery of an adequate supply of matzoth to key centers of Jewish life in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on an emergency basis, so that the Feast of the Passover which begins at sundown on Friday, March 27, and ends at sundown Saturday, April 4, of this year may be observed in keeping with five thousand seven hundred and twenty-four years of Jewish tradition.

The article presented by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

SOVIET SHUTS DOWN BAKERY FOR MATZOH

(By Henry Tanner)

Moscow, March 15.—Moscow's only matzoh bakery has been closed by the Soviet authorities after only 2 days of operation.

Chief Rabbi Yehuda Lev Levin, said today that the bakery, which had been set up in a rented dwelling, had been closed temporarily and for sanitary reasons. He appeared to hope that he might get permission to reopen it later this week.

The bakery was opened last Wednesday to produce the unleavened bread for Passover, which begins March 28. According to unofficial Jewish sources, it produced only 220 pounds of matzoh on the first day and a similar amount on Thursday.

Members of the Jewish congregation said the closing on Friday was at the request of the fire department. The action came at a time when it had become clear that there would not be nearly enough matzoh to satisfy the need of devout Jews during Passover.

There were angry scenes at the Central Synagogue this morning as elderly Jewish men and women, who had come to collect their share of matzoh, had to be turned away empty-handed.

Many of these persons said they had turned in the flour for their matzoh at the synagogue and had been promised an equivalent amount of unleavened bread.

Now they have neither flour nor matzoh, they said. Flour is fairly difficult to get in Moscow these days and buyers often have to queue for limited quantities.

Matzoh supplies are also reported to be insufficient in Leningrad and Kiev, two other Soviet cities with large Jewish populations. In Leningrad the Central Synagogue has not been able to bake matzoh even though it has its own baking facilities, according to unofficial reports.

Georgia is the only part of the country where matzoh has been baked in approximately sufficient quantities in past weeks, private reports said.

The Central Synagogue in Moscow was permitted to improvise a bakery to alleviate the plight of devout Jews since state-run bakeries were ordered to stop baking matzoh two years ago.

There has been no ban on the baking of matzoh by individual families. If a person bakes more than is required for his own needs and sells the surplus, however, he is breaking Soviet laws against private commerce.

Last year three persons were given jail sentences for the illegal sale of matzoh.

SUPPLIES FROM ABROAD

Earlier this month Georgi Lieb, president of the congregation of Moscow's second synagogue, said he expected shipments of matzoh from abroad to alleviate the shortage.

He said that about 10,000 pounds of matzoh would be sent from Denmark by Dr. Isaac Levin of New York, president of the American section of Agudas Israel, and that 1,600 pounds would be sent by Britain's chief rabbi, Dr. Israel Brodie. There are also reports of offers from Belgium and Israel.

The Soviet authorities are reported to be allowing private shipments from abroad.

ADDITIONAL TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION 163 TO LIE ON THE DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 163, which was introduced earlier today, be allowed to lie on the desk for 2 additional days until Friday, March 27. I do this on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, March 24, 1964.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 9), 1964:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be second lieutenants

Abbott, William E., Jr., AO3118698.
Acheson, Densel K., AO3107857.
Adams, David A., AO3116488.
Adams, David A., AO3119480.
Adams, George E., Jr., AO3108234.
Aiken, Gerald G., AO3116865.
Alcini, Gerald L., AO3108509.
Aldridge, Robert P., Jr., AO3109171.
Allen, Glenn D., Jr., AO3118699.
Alisp, Thomas E., AO3096196.
Alston, Harold R., AO3080214.
Ambrose, William C., AO3100228.
Andersen, Jack T., AO3115980.
Andersen, Niels B., AO3104681.
Anderson, James E., AO3106357.
Anderson, Richard C., AO3122215.
April, Paul K., AO3118467.
Arendt, Melvin L., Jr., AO3108066.
Arnaiz, Donald R., AO3107395.
Arnold, John D., AO3108510.
Arnold, William E., AO3117949.
Arthur, Thomas W., AO3119171.
Asakura, Takazumi, Jr., AO3095576.
Ash, Braxton W., AO3107141.
Asher, Laurence F., AO3118447.
Atchison, Richard M., AO3122705.
Attix, Harold B., Jr., AO3122451.
Atwater, Clayton F., AO31056720.
Atwood, Daryl G., AO3108667.
Ausman, William H., AO3107486.
Auth, Edward G., Jr., AO3117443.
Avizonis, Petras V., AO3072359.
Ayers, Norman D., AO3118826.
Ayers, Richard G., AO3120533.
Baber, Gary P., AO3107205.
Ballor, Ronald O., AO3128232.
Baily, Joseph J., III, AO3118427.
Baker, Guy F., AO3115979.
Baker, Marion K., AO3116706.
Baker, Roy T., AO3106252.
Baker, Willard L., Jr., AO3108368.
Balalis, Paul L., AO3107593.
Barazzone, Samuel W., AO3116718.
Barber, Hugh W., Jr., AO3108403.
Barker, John L., Jr., AO3107517.
Barker, William V. H., AO3116895.
Barkhurst, Paul D., AO3109329.
Barranco, Stephen S., AO3121996.
Bartsanti, Ronald F., AO3122161.
Barsotti, Paul J., AO3118828.
Barthelemy, Richard P., AO3118353.
Barton, Roland S., AO3116663.
Barwell, Robert R., AO3121102.
Bates, Roy O., Jr., AO3108727.
Bauer, John D., AO3116761.
Bauernschub, John P., Jr., AO3107921.
Bauhahn, Paul E., AO3116914.
Bayer, Peter F., AO3105306.
Bayer, Roger T., AO3116709.
Bayless, William E., AO3100687.
Bazet, Randolph A., Jr., AO3121828.
Beam, Richard M., AO3072668.
Beasley, Earle C., AO3108369.
Beaudry, Richard G., AO3108439.
Beers, L. N., AO3118155.
Beldy, Andrew J., AO3109082.
Bell, Jerald R., AO3118972.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD -- SENATE

5825

In the bill, I see there is provision for the appointment of a master.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. And the master would take the testimony, if facts were in issue; and he would report to the court.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is subsection (f):

(f) In any case in which the pleadings present issues of fact, the court may appoint a master and the order of reference may require the master to submit with his report a recommended order. The master shall be compensated by—

And so forth.

The hour is late. The Senator has been very generous with his time. While the particular section about which we have been speaking may have its limitation—and there are those who feel very strongly about the section—I wish to say that when I studied it I was very much impressed by the fact that it was as moderate a fair employment section as I have ever read. It is based essentially upon voluntary compliance, and it provides for the right of the Commission to take its facts to the courts. If an effort needs to be made to ascertain what the facts really are, the court may appoint a master. The master may take evidence and make recommendations as to a court order.

This particular section would require a good deal of discussion here. I hope that the Senator from Florida will again, at the proper time, give us the benefit of his knowledge on it. I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator has discussed the entire bill. It has been a very helpful discussion for the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. When I discuss the question again, which I expect to do, in some respects I shall be better informed in relation to certain of its technical features than I am today.

If we are getting ready to conclude for tonight—and we have had a 12-hour 10-minute day up to the present time—I wish to emphasize the fact that I do not really believe that this is the way to answer the problem.

In my judgment title VII is a particularly dangerous section. I believe that it would create more problems than now exist. I think that we would see it stultify the business community in many respects. It would take away from what we have had up to this point. The businessman who under our free enterprise system has the right of choice, the right to exercise his own managerial judgment, the right to employ people whom he thought would be most useful in his particular concern, would no longer be able to do so if the particular section to which I have referred should be adopted.

Furthermore, I think it would be a great harassment to the American business community and the free enterprise system, because while the able Senator from Minnesota has said that the bill is moderate with respect to its FEPC sections, I do not really believe that in the long run it would do anything other than require a businessman to hire a prospective employee because of his race or re-

ligion. For example, there might be a businessman who has had a history, we will say, of never having hired anyone of the Jewish faith previous to the time that the Commission would be set up. Perhaps if the bill is passed, he would be afraid the Commission would find that the fact that he had not previously hired anyone of that faith had "set a pattern."

The Commission might become like the National Labor Relations Board and some of the other commissions that lean all one way, or the employer might believe the Commission was that way. Immediately the Commission the first time someone of that faith comes to the employer seeking employment, the employer might think the Commission would find: "The pattern has already been set because we see that the businessman has never hired any men of the Jewish faith. He has never hired a Puerto Rican. We see that he has never hired any men of the colored race." Therefore he is almost guilty before he is started, and he might feel it necessary to hire that applicant regardless of his appraisal of his ability. There is no provision in the bill about the prospective employee's ability. The bill merely provides that the employer may not refuse to hire the prospective employee because of his race or color. The employer might refuse to hire him and say, "I am not refusing to hire him because of his color but because of his lack of ability." When we look at what he has been doing over the years, and knowing the pressures that will be on him if he does not hire that man, who may have some ability, but who may not be up to quite the ability of the man whom the employer would really like to have, the result might well be that employer would then be haled into court. He then would have to go to the expense of what would obviously be a somewhat protracted piece of litigation.

The employer is liable to be found guilty. He must either hire the prospective employee—even though he does not want him, even though he does not think he would fit into his shop, and even though he believes hiring the man would be detrimental to his own business—or if he did not hire him, he would be subject to a \$300 fine and 45 days in jail.

I cannot believe that proposed legislation of the kind of which we are now speaking would achieve the very lofty objectives which its sponsors have for it. On the contrary, I believe that it would interfere very seriously with rights guaranteed to all of our citizens, irrespective of race, color, or creed. It would have a devastating effect on our free-enterprise system. I believe it would lead to more bureaucracy. I think it is a most unfortunate section. I hope that it will be dropped from the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has not been reading the correct bill. I can understand after I have heard him discuss it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I heartily congratulate the Senator from Florida on his able speech

and the masterful way in which he has presented the case against the civil rights bill.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

An additional bill and joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2678. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor M. Ubieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to use full facilities of our Government to make arrangements for and to bring about delivery of an adequate supply of matzoth to key centers of Jewish life in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on an emergency basis, so that the Feast of the Passover which begins at Sundown, Friday, March 27, and ends at sundown Saturday, April 4, may be observed in keeping with 5,724 years of Jewish tradition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

Anti Sem.

FURNISHING OF MATZOTH TO JEWISH PEOPLE IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution calling upon the President to use the full facilities of our Government to make arrangements on an emergency basis for the delivery of an adequate supply of matzoth to the key centers of Jewish life in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, so the Feast of the Passover may be observed in keeping with over 5,000 years of Jewish tradition.

This joint resolution is a companion to one introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FEIGHAN on March 18. I ask that it remain at the desk until the close of Senate session Wednesday, March 25, so other Senators may have an opportunity to sponsor the resolution.

The Feast of the Passover commemorates the great event in Jewish life of the liberation of Israel from bondage in Egypt. It is the festival of freedom, and this year it will be observed from sundown on March 27 to April 4. Of course, the unleavened bread, matzoth, is a necessity for observance of the feast.

Last week the New York Times carried a disturbing article about the recent Soviet action in closing the only matzoth bakery in Moscow. This was the latest in a series of actions by the Soviet officials which have resulted in a shortage of matzoth available to the Jewish people. Shortages of matzoth are reported in other cities, and even if the Moscow bakery is reopened, it is inadequate to meet the need.

temper and faithfulness to man. Also from the Newfoundland come the double coat, fury underneath, long and curly above, and the oil secretion from the skin, which together enable the animal to withstand frequent plunges into freezing water to retrieve game. The Water Spaniel probably bequeathed superior retrieving abilities, and an obvious and remarkable love of sport. The Hound strain evidently contributed to the dog's strong power of scent, and to its extraordinary hardihood and endurance. The varied colors of the miscellaneous crosses, the yellow and tan of the Hound, and the black and white of the Water Spaniel and Newfoundland, blended to produce the Chesapeake's characteristic liver color.

In 1877, some of the descendants of Sailor and Canton were brought together at the poultry and fanciers' show at Baltimore. Despite the hodgepodge breeding separately pursued on the two shores of the Chesapeake Bay, the eastern and western shore dogs were found to be so alike in characteristics and conformation that they were together recognized as a distinct breed, and named the Chesapeake Bay ducking dog, or Chesapeake Bay retriever. They were divided into three classes: the otter dog, with wavy almost kinky, short hair; the curly dog, with longer hair; and the straight-haired dog. All were reddish-brown in color, and generally had a white spot on the breast. With time these distinctions tended to disappear, and the color of the dogs shaded to the color of dead grass.

Through records of the dogs exhibited at the show of 1877, the blood of Sailor and Canton can be traced to the later celebrated kennel owned by Mr. Dwight Mallory, at Twin Oaks, on Back River.

Twin Oaks was one of the ducking shores owned by Mr. Edward S. Bartlett, who was Mr. Mallory's father-in-law. Together with his partner, Thomas J. Hayward, Mr. Bartlett also owned ducking shores at Otter Point, on the Bush River, and Taylor's Island in the Upper Chesapeake Bay. It was natural that such sporting enthusiasts as Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Hayward should have placed before their establishment the symbols of their favorite sport, as monument and talisman.

Successors to the firm's original partners have kept the dogs and enjoyed the tradition, which has been strengthened by an interruption. Some years ago the dogs were removed, in the course of a redesign of the office building. Hard times followed, which some credited directly to the absence of the dogs. They were found and replaced, on either side of the Bartlett-Hayward doorway, where they stand today, to welcome visitors, and signify the firm's continuing prosperity.

MARIETTA P. TREE CALLS ON U.N. COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS TO CONDEMN ANTI-SEMITISM

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union and have urged that the United States take appropriate action regarding Soviet anti-Semitism. House Concurrent Resolution 268 which I sponsored is directed toward this issue.

In December 1963, in a speech on the floor of the House documenting the extent of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, I said that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights should address itself to this issue and "bring

pressure on the Soviet Union to cease its campaign of religious suppression and discrimination against 3 million of its citizens."

I am pleased that on March 12, 1964, a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, who is the U.S. representative in the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, urged the Commission on Human Rights to include a new article condemning anti-Semitism in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

In asking that the United Nations record its opposition to the "violent and hateful disease of anti-Semitism," Mrs. Marietta P. Tree made clear the position of the United States on this vital question. Although her speech did not mention the Soviet Union by name, it is obviously aimed at Soviet anti-Semitism. I hope that the Commission on Human Rights will bring ceaseless pressure on the Soviet Union until religious persecution and discrimination are eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Marietta P. Tree said eloquently:

Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about this Convention, if we are really trying to construct a document which will be meaningful in eliminating racial discrimination in all its forms, then let us strike boldly at all the forms of racial and ethnic discrimination. Let us strike frankly and speak plainly of anti-Semitism.

I include her speech at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY MRS. MARIETTA P. TREE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, INTRODUCING THE U.S. ARTICLE ON ANTI-SEMITISM FOR INCLUSION IN THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, MARCH 11, 1964

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has asked for the floor in order to introduce the U.S. proposal for a new article condemning anti-Semitism. We would like this proposal to be included in the record on this item even though the Commission may not have time to consider it in detail.

That such condemnation is needed is clear. Anti-Semitism has been a danger in the past and it is a danger today. The daily press constantly carries reports of Jews singled out for heavier punishment than others convicted of the same crimes, and of Jewish groups denied rights to publish and to carry on activities permitted without question to other groups. While the burden appears greater in some countries than in others, the study made by the Subcommission on Discrimination and Minorities in 1960 showed anti-Semitic incidents occurring in many different countries—often ignorant mischief but all too often persecution and destruction. Surely, no one here can deny facts coming to us from many sources or the need to reach into the attitudes and habits of thought which nourish anti-Semitism. My purpose in this statement is to deal with only two questions—why there should be an article on anti-Semitism in this particular convention, and what form it should take.

First, does an article on anti-Semitism belong to a Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination?

The Convention defines racial discrimination as any distinction based on "race, color, national, or ethnic origin." Inclusion of a special article against anti-Semitism does not imply that Jewish persons are to be considered as constituting a separate race.

Anti-Semitism is ethnic, in terms of culture, tradition, language, and inheritance. In addition to their religion, the vast majority of Jewish persons share a historic, cultural, and linguistic past, which constitute a common ethnic origin.

Anti-Semitism has often used a difference in religious practices as a pretext for discrimination, and I am sure that the declaration against religious intolerance will deal with its religious aspects. However, Jews who have associated themselves with other churches and modes of thought continue to suffer prejudice and discrimination because of their ancestry. Under these circumstances our convention would be less than complete if it failed to take cognizance of what in our own day has been the most horrifying result of racial hatred ever known: the planned program of annihilation that reduced the world population of Jews by one person out of every three. Furthermore, omission of a specific reference to anti-Semitism in this convention might be subject to misinterpretation. We condemn anti-Semitism in any form, and regardless of any pretext for it, and this is the reason we have sought its inclusion in this convention.

In short, the purpose of this article is to condemn anti-Semitism whether manifested as a form of racial discrimination or otherwise. To make this crystal clear, the United States is submitting a slightly revised text to read as follows:

"States parties condemn anti-Semitism, whether manifested as a form of racial discrimination or otherwise, and shall take action as appropriate for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to their jurisdiction."

Second, as to the form in which we should condemn anti-Semitism. The U.S. proposal is in the form of a separate article, rather than an amendment to some more general article, because we believe anti-Semitism is a particularly virulent form of ethnic discrimination and that all countries should be alerted to its danger.

For that reason I regret that the U.S.S.R. has suggested a series of amendments to our proposed article which confuse anti-Semitism with nazism, genocide, and other terms to make it only one of a list of possible errors in recent thought. Let us be honest here and recognize that anti-Semitism is a present as well as past danger, that it exists in countries where nazism is unknown and in forms which are infinitely cruel but may not be genocide, that it cannot be covered up forever by recalling the crimes of Hitler and the horrors of concentration camps, and that people everywhere must become freshly sensitive to its meaning and its reality. Let us be honest to realize how anti-Semitism has fed the evil purposes of dictators, Hitler included, and is being exploited even today to turn groups against each other and deflect attention from the failures of governments and the ineptitude of public administrators. We are opposed to the amendments of the U.S.S.R. because we believe they tend to minimize the urgency of this question, and suggest that anti-Semitism is not a matter of immediate and basic concern.

Since the defeat of Nazi Germany no state has pursued an overt and declared policy of genocide against an ethnic group. But we must recognize that some states where laws forbid discrimination in the most forceful terms nevertheless carry on policies which are designed to have the effect of obliterating an ethnic group. The biological differences of race cannot be exterminated by cultural deprivations, but ethnic differences, and sometimes nationality differences, are absolutely dependent on language, schools, publications, and other cultural institutions in order to survive. Cut an ethnic or national tradition off from these, and it

will die, however nourished the body of the citizen is by food, clothing, and shelter.

We must deal with anti-Semitism even when it takes the forms of deprivation of the religious and cultural heritage which makes this group unique. We should make it clear that a state which makes provision for German language schools for that ethnic group should not deny Yiddish or Hebrew schools to its Jews; that a state which can permit national and regional organizations of some ethnic groups should, under the principle of nondiscrimination, permit the same for Jews; that a state which permits recognized leaders of every other group to travel abroad to conferences and holy places should not be able to deny that right to Jewish leaders; that a state that finds facilities to publish textual materials in the language and traditions of some groups should not be able to deny this right to Jewish groups; that a state which is able to tolerate the differences in 100 nationalities should have no right whatever to extinguish those differences in the 101st.

We are not living in a world in which racial genocide would be permitted. But there can be such a thing as cultural or even ethnic genocide.

Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about this Convention, if we are really trying to construct a document which will be meaningful in eliminating racial discrimination in all its forms, then let us strike boldly at all the forms of racial and ethnic discrimination. Let us strike frankly and speak plainly of anti-Semitism.

Our amendment is designed to do this—to represent at least a starting point by putting the United Nations on record as opposed to this violent and hateful disease of anti-Semitism. We hope that all other nations will support our proposal.

Mr. Chairman; the intention of the General Assembly, as stated in the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, was to condemn all types of discrimination based on the simple fact of prejudice against the group into which a person is born, whether that group is distinguished by race or color, or by ethnic origin. That is also the basis of this Convention—as spelled out in the definition, and as stated throughout the articles we have already adopted. I hope the U.S. proposal will be adopted unanimously in this Commission, without crippling amendments.

THE 46TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF BYELORUSSIA

(Mr. LIBONATI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the 46th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia is commemorated in sadness this 25th day of March 1964.

The dismal fate of the Byelorussians independence declared on March 25, 1918—shortly after the disintegration of the Russian Empire—and its almost immediate absorption by the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics imposing upon it a fictitious statehood, are well known to the nations of the free world. It is a controlled colony of the Russian nation. Their intellectuals have been oppressed and decimated in great numbers. Its peoples have been brainwashed and subjected to continuous Russification by communistic administrative personnel, including army, and by propagandistic action.

The granting of United Nations status by the Russians is nullified by the prescription that only a Russian can represent the Byelorussians abroad.

Byelorussian publications and literature are suppressed and Russian literature and publications on purely Russian subjects flood the land. Influenced pressure is used to force Byelorussian literature and publications to use Russian subjects such as Lenin, Russian military problems and accomplishments, economic and political problems of the U.S.S.R., and to atheistic actions.

Its religious life is dominated by Russian views, and expressed in the Russian language. In 1960 there were 2,614 Greek Orthodox parishes—at present less than 200; the Roman Catholic reduced from 456 to less than 20. Similar conditions prevail as to the Jewish synagogues and Protestant churches, and other denominations.

The Government newspapers give prominence to numerous atheistic articles. Atheistic books are printed in mass.

Political terror spreads its fanged searing search even in the court trials of political personages. Wide publicity is given to these proceedings and the resulting death penalties.

Mass deportations of the youth to Siberian Forests and virgin farm and mining areas of Russia.

In spite of all these pressures and oppressive measures—these formidable and independent freedom loving people have maintained their religious beliefs and are untouched in their love of democracy institutions and the will of the people to control in governmental affairs.

The Central Committee in Moscow has viewed with serious apprehension the failure and shortcomings of the methods used in propagandizing the Byelorussian people to change their viewpoints on ideology, religion, and nationalism.

The theory of coexistence has not worked. The tensions against the people of the U.S.S.R. and their philosophy of life are ever present.

These brave people are looking to us to roll over their military foes. They are ready to join up in any effort that will restore their country's freedom in government. The oppressed nations seek our support toward their ultimate liberation. The right of self-determination for all nations must not be limited to the Asian and African nations but to those also under the Soviet yoke. The nations of the West have voluntarily or under colony pressure given up control of their colonial lands—Russia has been vehement in her support of these issues on the side of the peoples seeking their independence. Now it is her turn to do likewise for these nations held captive under Soviet domination. The Byelorussian people are celebrating their 46th anniversary of their independence. How long must this unfortunate nation wait to be given her freedom as an independent nation.

The United States is blessed with a leadership that is personified by the epitome of "courage." Our martyred President, John Kennedy, in his every action had demonstrated a longing eye toward

the realization of this goal—the freedom of all captive nations.

The positive actions of President Lyndon Johnson in his foreign policy toward the captive nations, reflects the same desire as his predecessor. We are fortunate in having his leadership.

The Department of State could alleviate these conditions somewhat by summary action now.

There would be a more favorable climate as a result of our program of cultural exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, if groups of artists were interchanged between the respective countries. The question of language usage would not be too great a handicap under proper supervision and modern electronic interpretation systems. The uplifting of the spirit of independence in the masses would be stimulated by viewing the performances of our artists—the Americans likewise would appreciate the artistic efforts of the Byelorussian performers. The Byelorussian cities visited would enthusiastically and with deep appreciation welcome the performance of the American group. The tie of cultural exchange would keep alive the fires of freedom.

Our State Department should also negotiate arrangements for the visitation of American citizens in greater numbers in order to permit thousands of those of Byelorussian ancestry to visit their relatives in their native villages and farm homes as part of the family, and to have free access of travel throughout the Nation.

The present arrangements are not only limited in quota, but also in travel to limited designated places by the Russian authorities. The practice today is to have the relatives of American citizens meet them at certain places where certain accommodations are designated by the authorities.

Under President Lyndon Johnson, the United States stands beside the Byelorussian people in their desire for the realization of full political independence. The Byelorussians are steeped in their suppressed desire for a separate autonomy from the Russian way of life. The youths of the nation are irreconcilable to the Russian doctrine on the philosophy of life. Even publicly showing their disaste and dissatisfaction over living conditions. The Voice of America broadcasts have not been wasted on these courageous people, yet fails to mention the non-Russian people living under Russian rule.

It is needless to say that March 25 can not be outwardly celebrated by the Byelorussians without being accused of treason against Russia by the puppets in authority—yet their hearts filled with the memory of their lost independence still secretly enkindle the fires of a freedom test, and a hope that the United States as a nation and the Americans of Byelorussian ancestry aid them in their sorry lot to regain their freedom as a nation.

Historians in the near future will write down the realization of the hopes of mankind in strong language, descriptive of stern action. Let us pray that the future of mankind be written in an aura of peace. To think otherwise is to fortell the doom of mankind forever.

utmost affection that I wish him well, and hope and pray for his return to work and service in full health for many years to come.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished president of Mr. Hoover's alma mater has authorized me to convey the following message which I read at this point:

DEAR CHIEF: I understand some of your friends are putting together a packet of get well wishes. I'm happy to be one of them. All Stanford joins me in wishing you the best.

Yours,

J. E. WALLACE STERLING,
President, Stanford University.

In today's issue the Palo Alto Times will join in this "Get well" wish for President Hoover. Under the terms of my unanimous-consent request I am pleased to include an advance copy of the Times editorial which will appear today.

The House of Representatives made it a special order of business today to tell Herbert Hoover with deep feeling, "Get well, Mr. President."

Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER voiced that wish for himself and his constituents—including the people of Palo Alto, the town Mr. Hoover called home while President. He also conveyed greetings from Stanford President Wallace Sterling and other university officials.

Mr. Hoover is convalescing in New York City from an illness that grew critical for several days last month. He fought it off with typical determination.

"The Chief" long ago convinced his Stanford community admirers that his physical constitution is as exceptional as his far-ranging mental powers. He has set a peerless example of remaining productively occupied in retirement.

We look forward to marking Mr. Hoover's 90th birthday in August.

Mr. Speaker, with a minimum of effort I could have filled this RECORD with hundreds of tributes and wishes for Mr. Hoover's speedy recovery. But quantity is not a true measure of sincerity.

Herbert Clark Hoover is revered and respected by all Americans. So on behalf of them we, who have been privileged to join together in this modest tribute, extend our good wishes and say again: "Get well, Mr. President."

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION INCREASES IN U.S.S.R.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the March 1964 issue of Freedom's Facts, published by the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, carries a timely and important article on "Religious Persecution Increases in U.S.S.R." The information contained in this article points up the systematic persecution of all people of all religious faiths in the U.S.S.R. It is timely because Christian believers the world over will observe this week the Feast of the Resurrection and Jewish believers the world over will observe the Feast of the Passover beginning at sundown on Friday, March 27.

All who believe in God or a Supreme Being have concern and compassion for those who suffer religious persecution in lands across the sea. Religious liberty is one of the most cherished rights of American democracy and we protect that right because we know that without its safekeeping all our liberties will be lost.

The article reads as follows:

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION INCREASES IN U.S.S.R.

In 1958 the Kremlin launched a 7-year campaign to destroy religion in the U.S.S.R. The campaign's main elements are:

1. Tightening restrictions upon priests, ministers, and rabbis.
2. Isolation of children and young people from religious contacts and instruction.
3. Prohibition against the raising of funds for the support of churches, or synagogues.
4. Constant barrages of antireligious propaganda in schools, on radio and TV, in speeches at factory and club meetings, and elsewhere.
5. Persecution, arrest and even execution of believers on whatever charges can be trumped up.

This antireligious campaign has been running in the Soviet Union for over 5 years with little notice from the outside world. Now the lid is blowing off.

JEWISH GROUPS TO MEET

Twenty-four Jewish religious and secular groups will meet in Washington, D.C., April 5 and 6 to consider the problem of oppression against Jews living in the Soviet Union.

Two of the 24 groups—the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.—are participants in the All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

What are the particulars? Over the past few years Jews have been singled out for persecution and even execution for alleged commission of economic crimes against the Soviet Union.

These crimes have included baking and distributing matzoth, unleavened bread, used in the observance of Passover; the sale of items to raise money to support the few synagogues left in the U.S.S.R.; manufacturing and selling consumer goods which the official Communist State apparatus are unable to provide for its people.

FEW SYNAGOGUES OR CHURCHES LEFT IN U.S.S.R.

Today there are fewer than 100 synagogues and religious institutions in the U.S.S.R. to care for one-fifth of the Jewish population of the world.

Based upon exhaustive research, Jewish leaders have concluded that the Jews in the U.S.S.R. are now threatened with disintegration and obliteration. As under the Nazis, in fact, Jews in the U.S.S.R. now must carry cards identified with a large "J."

But Jews are not alone the victims of persecution and arrest. Passports have been taken from orthodox monks who are then arrested and imprisoned for living without the proper identification papers. Monks have been forced from monasteries into parishes; the parishes are closed, and the monks have been arrested for being homeless vagabonds.

In Poland, supposedly a liberal area in the Communist bloc when it comes to religion, priests have been prohibited from visiting parishioners in their homes. They have been prevented from speaking of religion outside of their churches, and the number of churches has been severely limited.

Cardinal Wyszynski a few weeks ago displayed extreme courage in delivering a sermon in a tool shed to dramatize the Communist policy of limiting the number of churches permitted in the country.

SOVIET AIM: STAMP OUT RELIGION

The unmistakable Communist aim is to stamp out all religion in the U.S.S.R., and then follow through by stamping it out in all areas under Communist rule.

Why this hysterical persecution of religion? Communism is the doctrine of materialism, the doctrine of atheism. Religion—whether Jewish, Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, or Hindu—is the belief in a power higher than man, higher than all visible matter. Religious belief is a direct denial of communism. Ultimately, one or the other must rule men's minds.

And this scares the masters in the Kremlin. Young people in the Soviet Union are restless now. They are bored. They see little future for themselves in a life-stifling totalitarian system. They are ripe for new ideas. They are ripe for religion.

The Communist reaction is to intensify its drive in schools, on radio and television, in the press, in talks at factories and in clubs to extend indoctrination of the public in atheism.

A recently issued Kremlin order proclaims that children and young people "will be increasingly protected from the influence of church people and from their parents should they force them to carry on religious activities."

So a life-and-death struggle between communism and religion is now going on inside the Soviet Union. Can you do anything about it? Of course.

ACTION YOU CAN TAKE

Whether you do anything or not, naturally, is up to you. Here, however, are some ideas of what you can do if you do decide to do something:

Support every effort of your church or synagogue to revive and stimulate religious life inside of the Soviet Union and elsewhere behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Support the broadcast of religious programs to peoples of the U.S.S.R. and of all captive nations.

Support public demands for a complete disclosure and condemnation of Communist oppression of religion and persecution of believers.

Consistently point out and urge others to point out that Communists are atheists who aggressively seek to undermine and obliterate religious observances and religious belief everywhere, including in the United States.

Your support, however much or little it may be, can be the needed extra measure to turn the tide against tyranny and toward freedom inside of all Communist-ruled countries.

ANTI-SEMITISM AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I learned that the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, in its consideration of the Draft Convention on Racial Discrimination, had discussed and forwarded to the Economic and Social Council a provision condemning anti-Semitism as an international offense.

It is my understanding that although the Economic and Social Council may not have time to take up the issue at its forthcoming July meeting, the General Assembly will definitely deliberate upon the matter during its regular session in the fall.

I should make clear that the Human Rights Commission did not adopt the anti-Semitism clause in the usual sense of that term; nor did it formally vote or debate the language of the section as proposed by the American delegate. It decided, very simply, to forward the proposal as a suitable insertion in the Draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

Nevertheless, this accomplishment cannot be underestimated. The American delegation to the Human Rights Commission deserves our gratitude and praise for its stanch perseverance. The initial success was not at all assured. It is our hope that this small, yet meaningful, first step will eventually yield the forthright universal condemnation of anti-Semitism which we seek.

The article, as proposed by Mrs. Marietta Tree for insertion in the Draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, reads as follows:

States parties condemn anti-Semitism and shall take action as appropriate for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to their jurisdiction.

In advocating this step, we are recognizing anti-Semitism as a form of racial discrimination. That is to say, manifestations of anti-Semitism are primarily ethnic; they arise as an attack upon a culture, tradition, language, and inheritance, rather than constituting an exclusively religious bias. We are not saying that the Jews constitute a separate race. But we are recognizing that the Jewish community possesses a common ethnic origin, and that anti-Semitism as such directs itself most frequently against that distinctness.

Within the context of the pending treaty we are speaking of anti-Semitism as a public policy, actively or subtly perpetrated by a government. The article, realized as an organic part of the Convention, will depend upon the Convention's implementing clauses for its proper execution.

This may involve the International Court of Justice at The Hague, or some more informal avenue. In any case, there must be more than strictly national enforcement, and I am certain that our Government accepts this view as a necessary adjunct of the Convention as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be watching developments carefully throughout the year, and I am hopeful that the organs of the United Nations will act to incorporate an anti-Semitism clause in deliberating upon the draft covenant on racial discrimination. I am aware of the difficulties and complexities. But our initial success makes me reasonably optimistic, and I urge upon our Government the energetic perseverance which to date has yielded impressive results.

In 1962, I submitted a resolution expressing the sense of this House that the United States work through the United Nations in securing a U.N. General Assembly condemnation of anti-Semitism. This resolution was directed at the Soviet Union, which hitherto has been the most flagrant violator of the human right to preserve and extend an ethnic,

religious, or cultural identity. I still advocate this step.

It is true that the recently proposed article does not mention a state by name. We must realize that as far as the Draft Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination is concerned, any attempt to single out a nation by direct reference, especially a great power, would doom the entire effort at the start.

But it is indisputably clear that the proposed clause has universal application. Anti-Semitism will be condemned by all signatory states, and all those states, including the Soviet Union if she ultimately ratifies, will pledge themselves to erase the ugliness of this outrageous practice.

So I commend the progress evidenced of late in the United Nations. I further urge upon our Government to exert its full powers in the future for the ultimate incorporation of an anti-Semitism provision in the Draft Convention on Racial Discrimination. This country can make no more meaningful contribution toward the achievement of universally recognized human rights than to lead, and to succeed in, this endeavor to eradicate the disgrace of anti-Semitism wherever it exists.

I would like at this point to include in the RECORD the statement of Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, U.S. representative in the United Nations Human Rights Commission, which the American delegate gave before the Commission on March 12:

STATEMENT BY MRS. MARIETTA P. TREE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has asked for the floor in order to introduce the U.S. proposal for a new article condemning anti-Semitism. We would like this proposal to be included in the record on this item even though the Commission may not have time to consider it in detail.

That such condemnation is needed is clear. Anti-Semitism has been a danger in the past and it is a danger today. The daily press constantly carries reports of Jews singled out for heavier punishment than others convicted of the same crimes, and of Jewish groups denied rights to publish and to carry on activities permitted without question to other groups. While the burden appears greater in some countries than in others, the study made by the Subcommission on Discrimination and Minorities in 1960 showed anti-Semitic incidents occurring in many different countries—often ignorant mischief but all too often persecution and destruction. Surely no one here can deny facts coming to us from many sources or the need to reach into the attitudes and habits of thought which nourish anti-Semitism. My purpose in this statement is to deal with only two questions: Why there should be an article on anti-Semitism in this particular Convention, and what form it should take.

First, does an article on anti-Semitism belong in a convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination?

The convention defines racial discrimination as any distinction based on "race, color, national, or ethnic origin." Inclusion of a special article against anti-Semitism does not imply that Jewish persons are to be considered as constituting a separate race. Anti-Semitism is ethnic, in terms of culture, tradition, language, and inheritance. In addition to their religion, the vast majority of Jewish persons share an historic, cul-

tural, and linguistic past, which constitutes a common ethnic origin.

Anti-Semitism has often used a difference in religious practices as a pretext for discrimination, and I am sure that the declaration against religious intolerance will deal with its religious aspects. However, Jews who have associated themselves with other churches and modes of thought continue to suffer prejudice and discrimination because of their ancestry. Under these circumstances, our convention would be less than complete if it failed to take cognizance of what in our own day has been the most horrifying result of racial hatred ever known, the planned program of annihilation that reduced the world population of Jews by one person out of every three. Furthermore, omission of a specific reference to anti-Semitism in this convention might be subject to misinterpretation. We condemn anti-Semitism in any form, and regardless of any pretext for it, and this is the reason we have sought its inclusion in this convention.

In short, the purpose of this article is to condemn anti-Semitism whether manifested as a form of racial discrimination or otherwise. To make this crystal clear, the United States is submitting a slightly revised text to read as follows:

"States parties condemn anti-Semitism and shall take action as appropriate for its speedy eradication in the territories subject to their jurisdiction."

Second, as to the form in which we should condemn anti-Semitism. The U.S. proposal is in the form of a separate article, rather than an amendment to some more general article, because we believe anti-Semitism is a particularly virulent form of ethnic discrimination and that all countries should be alerted to its danger.

For that reason I regret that the U.S.S.R. has suggested a series of amendments to our proposed article which confuse anti-Semitism with nazism, genocide and other terms to make it only one of a list of possible errors in recent thought. Let us be honest here and recognize that anti-Semitism is a present as well as past danger, that it exists in countries where nazism is unknown and in forms which are infinitely cruel but may not be genocide, that it cannot be covered up forever by recalling the crimes of Hitler and the horrors of concentration camps, and that people everywhere must become freshly sensitive to its meaning and its reality. Let us be honest to realize how anti-Semitism has fed the evil purposes of dictators, Hitler included, and is being exploited even today to turn groups against each other and deflect attention from the failures of governments and the ineptitude of public administrators. We are opposed to the amendments of the U.S.S.R. because we believe they tend to minimize the urgency of this question, and suggest that anti-Semitism is not a matter of immediate and basic concern.

Since the defeat of Nazi Germany no state has pursued an overt and declared policy of genocide against an ethnic group. But we must recognize that some states where laws forbid discrimination in the most forceful terms nevertheless carry on policies which are designed to have the effect of obliterating an ethnic group. The biological differences of race cannot be exterminated by cultural deprivations, but ethnic differences, and sometimes nationality differences, are absolutely dependent on language, schools, publications, and other cultural institutions in order to survive. Cut an ethnic or national tradition off from these, and it will die, however nourished the body of the citizen is by food, clothing, and shelter.

We must deal with anti-Semitism even when it takes the forms of deprivation of the religious and cultural heritage which makes this group unique. We should make it clear that a state which makes provision

1964

5951

for German language schools for that ethnic group should not deny Yiddish or Hebrew schools to its Jews; that a state which can permit national and regional organizations of some ethnic groups should, under the principle of nondiscrimination, permit the same for Jews; that a state which permits recognized leaders of every other group to travel abroad to conferences and holy places should not be able to deny that right to Jewish leaders; that a state that finds facilities to publish textual materials in the language and traditions of some groups should not be able to deny this right to Jewish groups; that a state which is able to tolerate the differences in 100 nationalities should have no right whatever to extinguish those differences in the 101st.

We are not living in a world in which racial genocide would be permitted. But there can be such a thing as cultural or even ethnic genocide.

Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about this Convention, if we are really trying to construct a document which will be meaningful in eliminating racial discrimination in all its forms, then let us strike boldly at all the forms of racial and ethnic discrimination. Let us strike frankly and speak plainly of anti-Semitism.

Our amendment is designed to do this—to represent at least a starting point by putting the United Nations on record as opposed to this violent and hateful disease of anti-Semitism. We hope that all other nations will support our proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the intention of the General Assembly, as stated in the declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, was to condemn all types of discrimination based on the simple fact of prejudice against the group into which a person is born, whether that group is distinguished by race or color, or by ethnic origin. That is also the basis of this Convention—as spelled out in the definition, and as stated throughout the articles we have already adopted. I hope the U.S. proposal will be adopted unanimously in this Commission, without crippling amendments.

PRESIDENT SHOWS SKILL IN BROKEN FIELD RUNNING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it has been most interesting to view the broken field running of President Johnson in regards to what apparently was a slip of the lip in a January 15, 1964 White House chat with leaders of the promedicare lobby. He stated very clearly at the time:

We are going to try to take all of the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the "haves" and give it to the "have nots" that need it so much.

Of course, this was directly in line with what many senior citizen lobbies are holding out as the answer to medical problems confronting their generation. All of the way through his remarks he alluded to this type of approach—free basic medical care for those over 65 regardless of need, to be paid for by assessing or taking from those who have or who are earning a livelihood. Everything in his remarks indicated that he knew very well what he was talking about.

In his March 15, 1964, television interview on his first 100 days in office, he fielded the question concerning this

strong statement and declared that he was really talking about taking this money from departments and agencies which had more than enough and giving it to a new poverty program which would be a have not. A close reading of the statement which was issued by the White House following the January 15, 1964 meeting with medicare leaders would not seem to support this contention. I am including the complete text of his statement at the conclusion of these remarks.

There are several glaring holes in the President's explanations. First, he was not talking about the poverty program when addressing the pro-medicare group. He was talking about meeting health care needs of the elderly—those needy and those not needy—though a compulsory social security approach. His exact words were:

Many of our citizens have reached their senior years without adequate medical means to solve their economic, social and medical problems. Many of them are poorly housed and poorly fed and are actually dependent on charity for the medical care that they get. So I think that it behooves all of us to share these burdens, because their problems are not of their own choosing, but rather due to a changing society.

Now this pretty well sounds like the point of his "haves" and "have nots" reference. Of course, the latter is a little blunter than he probably wanted to put it but there can be little doubt that, reduced to its simple elements, this is exactly what he had in mind.

This broken field running brings to mind his former position on civil rights and medicare. In 1950 he wrote the following letter which professed his opposition to socialized medicine. I suppose he would now say that in opposing socialized medicine he was not really talking about the compulsory medicare approach which he is now advocating. If there is a difference, it is in degree and not in basic substance. It is socialized, compulsory medicare. Of course, his letter is another good example of political sleight of hand—it can mean just about anything to anybody.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 28, 1950.

Mrs. THOS P. CAUGHLIN,
Dallas, Tex.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Thank you for making available to me a copy of the resolution passed by your organization, opposing any form of compulsory health insurance.

Ever since my election to Congress 13 years ago I have been in complete opposition to socialized medicine. I assure you that I shall always work against legislation which in my judgment would circumvent the right of our citizens to select physicians of their own choice.

If you will convey this information to your members, I shall be very grateful. Please tell them, too, that I hope I may continue to share their views on legislation pending here.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Another prime example of this type of artful dodging was his March 19, 1957, letter to an Arlington, Va., voter on the civil rights bill. The Senator from Texas sounded like a Dixiecrat when he wrote:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1957.

Mr. _____,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR MR. _____: I do not know where you could have gotten the idea that I am supporting "the so-called bill for civil rights legislation now before Congress." Certainly I have made no statement to that effect nor have I intimated to anyone that I plan any such support.

The bill that has been introduced is one to which I am very much opposed, as I do not believe it would advance any legitimate cause.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The letter to which he responded was as follows:

MARCH 11, 1957.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: I, personally, am very much disappointed to see by the press that you are supporting the so-called bill for civil rights legislation now before Congress. In reality, such a law, under the control of a rabid politician like Brownell, will deny to every American rights and liberties which we now have.

Certainly anyone can see that we are in grave danger of losing our constitutional rights under some of the fantastic decisions now being made by our Federal courts, without the Congress passing any political laws to aid in the further destruction of our Bill of Rights, which has been our protection and shield for almost 200 years.

If you have not read over our Bill of Rights lately, I am attaching a copy and I would be greatly pleased if you would be kind enough to spend a few minutes in contemplation as to how it is possible to fit such political legislation into amendments 1, 6, 7, and 10 of this great document.

Your great leadership in the Senate for what is morally right certainly has been an inspiration to millions. Therefore, I urge you not to support a politically designed bill which will deny to every American certain rights now granted to us by our Constitution.

Please, Senator, don't use your great influence for this political legislation which will destroy more civil liberties and civil rights than it will ever protect.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Speaker, I feel that President Johnson should have nothing to fear from a frank and straightforward statement of his views. We certainly look for more than artful dodging from the leader of this great Nation. Maybe he stated the case a little strongly when he was surrounded by the friendly champions of socialized medicine and referred to taking from the "haves" and giving to the "have nots." If he did, however, there was little reason to later retract his views simply because they sounded a bit drastic. The American people are looking for honesty in high office and they will support it if and when they find it.

The complete and official White House transcript of the January 15 remarks are as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO A GROUP OF LEADERS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF SENIOR CITIZENS IN THE FISH ROOM

Mr. Celebreeze, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sorry that I have been delayed a little bit in getting in here this morning, but I am happy that you are here and that you have a

March 24

chance to come to this house that belongs to all of us.

There is one thing you can say about the Presidency: You have a variety of matters and you never get bored with handling one problem. But I don't know any problem that has ever faced all of our people that should concern us more than the one about which we meet this morning.

The 20th century, in which we live, has blessed most of us with much longer lives, but this blessing has brought with it a very great responsibility. That responsibility is one that you, as very special messengers, must see that all of the people of this country live up to. Many of our citizens have reached their senior years without adequate medical means to solve their economic, social, and medical problems. Many of them are poorly housed and poorly fed and are actually dependent on charity for the medical care that they get.

So I think that it behooves all of us to share these burdens, because their problems are not of their own choosing, but rather, due to a changing society.

One problem that I think we have met this morning to tackle is the need for a social security health insurance plan. This great Nation, the most powerful of all nations, should no longer continue to ask our old people to trade dignity and self-respect for hospital and nursing home care. This is something that I think is good for all of us to realize, and most of us to remember.

Our older people are likely to be hospitalized three times as often as younger people, but their income is less than half that of people under 65. The end result is what? They then turn to public welfare. This is not the American way. The social security health insurance plan which President Kennedy worked so hard to enact is the American way; it is practical; it is sensible; it is fair; it is just. It says that the average worker and his employer would each contribute an average of only 25 cents a week during the employee's working career. In his old age a retired worker can take care of his own hospital and nursing home expenses with dignity. More than that, he can choose his own doctor. He can choose his own hospital. He can do it all without being crushed by the intolerable burdens of extensive hospital care.

That kind of a program makes sense to two of America's most distinguished public personages, men of great vision and compassion and experience—Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and Congressman KING, of California, who honor us with their presence and who, through the years, have led fights like these that bring better life to more people. They have come here this morning to let you know that they have enlisted for the duration, and while we do not have many sailors in the crowd, we are going to answer all of the opposition with the statement that "We have just begun to fight."

We think this program is just. We think this program is necessary. We think this program makes sense. We think this program is going to be the law of the land. This is the prudent American way to make sure that elderly citizens can retain their dignity and retain their solvency.

We have so much to be proud of in this country, so much to be thankful for, so much to preserve and so much to protect, but nothing that we want to protect more than those who have reached their later years and want the privilege of, in dignity, providing for themselves.

I wish that somehow, some way, that each of us in this room who feels the needs of this program for a moment could put himself in the position of some older person that we know—that could be a grandmother, a mother, to some of us a brother—and put ourselves in their position and ask ourselves how would we feel if the positions were re-

versed? Would we want to stoop and bend and plead for funds to be shoveled out of the State and Federal Treasury by means of a means test to determine whether we could go to a hospital and, if so, how long we could stay, or would we prefer a program of our own where we could take 25 cents a week and our employer could take 25 cents a week, and then deduct it—it would really only cost him about 12 cents when it is over with—and put that in a plan that ultimately would provide these benefits?

I think we are fortunate to be Americans, but America is particularly fortunate to have so many citizens like those in this room who are especially interested in a plan of this kind, and with the help of the good Lord, Senator ANDERSON and Congressman KING and you people who speak for so many other folks, we are going to pass it.

You know, I have a little contest going on among my Cabinet members. One of the great legacies President Kennedy left me was the finest Cabinet that any President could assemble. They are so good that I didn't even want one of my own. I wanted all of them to stay right where they are.

We are determined that this Nation is going to be strong enough to secure the peace and to protect this country, but we are not going to throw our weight around. We hope we are going to be wise enough to prevent the necessity of ever using that strength.

This Nation is going to be prudent enough to be solvent, where we can pay our bills and where our checks will be honored.

We are going to try to take all of the money that we think is unnecessarily being spent and take it from the "haves" and give it to the "have nots" that need it so much.

So we are going to have a solvent Nation, but strength and solvency alone don't quicken the heartbeat. The thing that really makes a great nation is compassion. We are going to have strength and solvency and compassion, love for thy neighbor, compassion and understanding for those who are less fortunate.

Secretary McNamara will start down that long road of explaining all of our decisions of the last 50 days this week before the Congress.

Secretary Dillon is already reporting for duty every morning early and staying late in the evening to try to get that tax bill that is so essential to the economy of this country.

Not to be outdone, Secretary Celebrezze has already evolved a plan and a program where we hope that in due time we will all meet here in this same house and have a signing ceremony for the program that means so much to all of us.

Mr. Secretary, you give us some indication of the date and we will all be here.

A tour of the White House has been arranged for those of you who can spare the time and would like to see it. I would like very much to spend more time with you myself. I am going to have a chance to walk around the room for a moment, if you will just delay the rest of your deliberations, but if any of you want to, we would be very happy to have you tour the White House.

THE SILENT TARIFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, "The Silent Tariff" is an interesting news item that should be read by all Members of the House.

In this connection, I submit a report I have made on the question recently:

THE SILENT TARIFF (By John J. Snyder)

There will be a silent issue in this year's election. It rarely will be mentioned, but it will influence every action which the next President will take. It will never make the headlines, but it influences everyone, every day. Identity: the tariff.

No other problem carries so many far-reaching implications as the tariff. Although the word "tariff" may customarily be relegated to the history book, we can no longer ignore its existence. If we continue to shun the tariff issue, we may awaken to find world trade shunning us. But why, you ask, is a tariff so important this year?

For 34 years the United States has been operating under the same tariff, and the record for those years is not praiseworthy. At best, many tariff measures have proven to be shortsighted, temporary remedies for a problem which is not well understood. For example, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, which the United States entered in 1948, sought to raise world living standards through reciprocal trade. However, the agreement failed not only to promote reciprocal trade, but actually contradicted numerous existing U.S. tariff laws. The United States is left in the embarrassing position of being an organizer of an organization which brings it no benefits.

Not only do the faulty tariff policies of the past call for immediate change, but the challenge of the future alerts us to our potentially precarious position in world trade.

Today the European Economic Community has a gross national product with a growth rate twice that of our annual rating. The actual challenge of the Common Market may not be here today, but it looms as a specter in the future. A continuation of present policies could lead to economic isolation; conversely, a removal of all tariffs would destroy our economic system. Only a carefully conceived, long-term program can amend our policies, and 1964 is the perfect time to start.

SPECIAL REPORT

It is interesting to note the reaction of a steel town newspaper when the problem of the local mills because of trade were publicized by a public statement from Dr. George A. Roberts, president of Vanadium Alloys Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa.

The editorial shows the relationship between free trade and reduced wages. The spectra of foreign competition sits at every contract conference between labor and management, it haunts every new legislative proposal on labor standards, wage and hour laws, compensation, social security and all public spending.

The editorial follows:

TARIFFS, COSTS INTERRELATED

Excluding certain labor leaders, little enthusiasm can be found for the 35-hour work week idea as the answer to unemployment. In fact, all indications point to an increase in joblessness if this principle is adopted.

Most opponents, including the Johnson administration, are quick to point out that 40 hours pay for 35 hours work would increase product costs to do serious damage to international trade.

Rejection of arbitrarily increased labor costs at this time solely on the basis of the effect on international trade is justified.

Never before in the memory of most Americans has it been as tough to compete with the rising industrial empires of Europe, Japan, and Canada as it is today.

Even in the U.S. domestic market, foreign producers of steel, automobiles, and other products are giving American producers a race for their money.

dependents and all our service people and their dependents—I voted for the servicemen's pay raise on May 8, 1963 and I have tried to help our farmers, our businessmen, our aged, our blind, our crippled, our unemployed, our people over 45 years of age who seek work and our boys and girls who undertake to get work.

Within the last 3 years I have introduced two bills to enable more students and teachers to work in Washington in the summertime for the Government in order to learn more about our Government. These bills passed the House of Representatives by record votes of over 300 votes for to less than 25 against.

I have mentioned I have tried to help our aged. I voted for the Kerr-Mills bill.

LONGVIEW, TEX.,
August 6, 1963.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to my recent letter to you I've received phone calls from seven of my fellow constituents asking me what I had done to incur your wrath. I had been under the impression that you had voted for a King-Anderson-type bill. Therefore I wrote Mr. Williston for your voting record and enclose his reply. It seems you had not supported socialized medicine and that I owe you an apology.

I also urge you to continue your voting against any form of federalized or socialized medicine and I may bring my wife and two children to visit you, your wife and five children. Make it specific and we will be there.

A copy of this letter has been mailed to seven of the doctors here in Longview.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER CAVE, M.D.

H.R. 221 passed the House on August 19, 1963. It would extend the benefits of the war orphans educational assistance act to children of 100 percent permanently disabled service-connected veterans. I favored the legislation.

I had introduced H.R. 177 on January 9, 1963, which is a bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code:

To provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from wartime service-connected disability.

In the first session of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 7724, "a bill to amend section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to clarify the meaning of the term 'change of program of education or training' as used in such section." A favorable report was given on my bill by the American Legion on July 15, 1959.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DORN: I understand that you will preside at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Education and Training of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee scheduled to be held on July 21 in connection with H.R. 4306 and H.R. 7724.

The American Legion is not asking for the privilege of a personal appearance on either one of these bills.

We are not in a position to support H.R. 4306.

In connection with H.R. 7724, while we

have no resolution on the subject matter, I would advise that the American Legion's rehabilitation representatives feel such an amendment to section 1622 of title 38 of the United States Code is desirable. We, therefore, trust the subcommittee will favorably consider H.R. 7724.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

The Veterans' Administration gave a favorable report on my bill. The bill was reported favorably by the Dorn subcommittee on July 21, 1959, and its provisions have now become law.

I quote from the Washington Post of March 5, 1964, some words about a dinner given in Washington in March 1964, by the American Legion national commander, Hon. Daniel F. Foley:

There were no formal speeches, although in his brief remarks Commander Foley mentioned the GI bill of rights, which was passed 20 years ago.

"Many of you in this audience tonight played a part in the passage of that bill," Foley said, "both as Legionnaires and as Members of Congress, and to all of you, the veteran population of this Nation owes a vote of thanks that would be difficult, if not impossible, to repay."

I actively supported the so-called GI bill. At this point I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the pertinent part of a letter written to me by Mr. Harry E. Rather:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., April 26, 1944.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: Thanks for your prompt reply in regard to the resolution passed by the department executive committee regarding the Legion's GI bill of rights for World War II veterans. We know that you are for this legislation. We have known it all along and we are very pleased to find that you were at least one of the Congressmen from Texas to sign discharge petition No. 8.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY E. RATHER,
Department Adjutant.

I worked diligently to help pass the terminal leave legislation for enlisted men.

TERMINAL LEAVE FOR ENLISTED MEN AND LETTER ENDORSING BECKWORTH'S BILL—H.R. 1160

(June 7, 1946)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1943, I introduced a bill (H.R. 3876) to provide terminal leave for enlisted men. On January 8, 1945, I introduced H.R. 1160, a slightly modified form of my first bill. The national legislative committee of the American Legion endorsed my bill H.R. 1160. Several Members of Congress and I appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee urging the passage of the terminal leave legislation. I include at this point the endorsement of the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., October 24, 1945.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are, as you know, vitally interested in your bill, H.R. 1160, which provides terminal leave to enlisted men in the same manner as is now given to officers, except that it also provides that the compensation to which the soldier

is entitled shall be paid in a lump sum, which, of course, is a very good idea.

Demobilization is taking place at such a rapid rate at the present time that unless this is enacted into law quickly it is not going to benefit very many GI's.

It does not seem to me as though it is a very controversial issue and that the House Military Affairs Committee could make up its mind very readily as to how they feel about it. We shall appreciate very much if action can be had on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

I was 1 of 218 Members of the House to sign the petition—the 218th signature was obtained April 17, 1946—which authorized the bringing of the legislation to the floor of the House.

I have undertaken at all times to cooperate with the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion.

I quote part of a letter written December 31, 1945, which I received from Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Kansas City, Mo.:

I have the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinting your remarks and the various communications you have received in connection with your activities in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and I wish to express my appreciation for your efforts along this line.

Also I quote a part of a letter which was written to me March 13, 1964, by one of the outstanding leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

You are known to have supported all veteran legislation.

I certainly appreciate these statements.

I was chairman of the War Claims Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This is the subcommittee under which prisoner of war legislation was considered. It helped prisoners of war.

I have been second ranking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—next to the chairman—this committee handles oil, gas, transportation, and communications legislation. I was chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee, the Airplane Accidents Investigating Subcommittee and the Newsprint and Brands and Grade Labeling Subcommittees.

As one who was born and raised on the farm, I have tried to help our cattle people. Several members of our family depend on the growing of cattle for their living. I include a letter at this point from Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1964.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I am enclosing a copy of the meat import bill and a copy of a statement which has been prepared for me, telling just what the bill does, its background, etc. Your interest in and help with the bill is greatly appreciated.

Most sincerely,

A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6143

Soviet Russian nation. Byelorussians are being russified by Russian schools, Russian newspapers and books, with Russian officials and soldiers being sent in great masses into the Byelorussian S.S.R. The Russians occupy all leading positions in the country. Churches are being closed.

Deportations of Byelorussians to the virgin regions of Asia are continuing. Complete families are deported as are skilled single persons. Beside Communist Party pressure, the government also uses various tricks. The school of mechanization of agriculture in Tula—near Moscow—is attracting the Byelorussian youth by many promises. However, after graduation, the people will be sent to work in the virgin regions.

In all phases of life, oppression has replaced freedom for the brave Byelorussians. Yet, though they live under this yoke, not under law, they keep in their hearts and minds the hope of again being free. Let us join those still there, their relatives and descendants here, in the prayer that this hope will soon be a reality.

PAPAYA AS A TOBACCO SUBSTITUTE

(Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, few medical questions have stirred such public interest or created more scientific debate than the tobacco-health controversy. The Surgeon General of the United States has stated that the interrelationships of smoking and health are undoubtedly complex. Because the health and well-being of millions of Americans are involved, the Federal Government has a responsibility for seeking the answers.

I should like to suggest as a possible answer the use of the leaf of the papaya, a popular fruit produced in my State of Hawaii, which is presently being tested as a "safe" tobacco substitute. The efficacy and enjoyment of a cigarette made from papaya is something to which I can personally attest. As a member of the youthful neighborhood gang, seeking to savor the privileges and delights of manhood, I surreptitiously sampled my first cigarette, which was composed of shredded dry papaya leaves. The pleasurable coughs experienced by me with this experimentation of a tobacco substitute leads me to conclude, even today, that further research by our scientists and chemists would support my beliefs that through the use of papaya leaves as a tobacco substitute, smoking pleasure could be had without any hazard to health.

I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a research into this matter, and if legislation be necessary I shall seek your assistance.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. GONZALEZ was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, 1964, is the 143d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On this day in 1821 Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Agia Lavra declaring the independence of the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire. After a bitter and costly 7-year struggle the heroic and greatly outnumbered Greeks won their freedom and 400 years of subjugation was ended. Once again the spirit of Thermopylae had triumphed.

The words "spirit of Thermopylae" are not merely a platitude, to be uttered lightly or to designate any ordinary occasion. For this spirit is what makes Western civilization and democracy what it is today. It is the same spirit that gave rise to the birth of democracy in ancient Greece. And it is not only the same spirit that urged the people of Greece to fight for their freedom in 1821, but it is the same spirit that urged them to fight unceasingly against the Nazi tyranny as well as the Communist aggression. I think it does well for us to remember not only the war of 1821, but also the continual, unflinching Greek resistance against the Nazis during World War II, and the successful fight against the Communists following that war.

It is well to remember these events because the Greek resistance to the Nazi invader came at a time when many of the countries of Europe capitulated and even went over to the side of the enemy without any semblance of the kind of struggle put up by the patriotic and freedom loving Greeks. Greek resistance to communism was greatly aided by the Truman doctrine by which the American people announced their firm intent to help the Greek people defend their freedom. But the battle itself was one with Greek blood alone.

In 1962 President Kennedy said the following in a message to the Greek people on the 15th anniversary of the Truman doctrine:

Today we are joined together in an effort to strengthen the cultural and spiritual ties we share and for our part we pledge our loyalty to our faithful and gallant Greek friends. Together we have accomplished much and, united in purpose, there is little we cannot do in the future. We assure the Greek people of our continued support against the dangers which confront us both, as well as our goods and deeds to help in the quest for progress.

These words are as true and appropriate today as they were on the day they were spoken. The American people will never forget the close ties between our two great nations, and to the entire Greek people as well as the more than 1½ million Americans of Greek origin, I would like to say, "Happy Anniversary."

SOVIETS RENEGE ON PROMISE TO DELIVER MATZOH SHIPMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the profoundly disturbing reports emanating from

Soviet Russia that the Communist authorities have refused to unpack and deliver at least 50,000 pounds of Passover matzoh which they had previously assured the Jewish community.

These matzoh packages were sent by U.S. citizens. There were reports in yesterday's newspapers that only in one case had a delivery been made to a prescribed recipient, who is Moscow's Chief Rabbi Yehudi Leib Levin.

This despicable turn of events is symptomatic of the deceitful approach of the Soviets toward their Jewish people. They wish to give an impression that anti-Semitism in Russia is an illusion. The facts speak otherwise.

Early in February the Soviet Embassy here in Washington publicly proclaimed that Americans could ship, by individual parcels or in bulk form, packages of matzoh to the Soviet Union.

But only last week, Russian citizens were told by their Government that acceptance of these parcels constituted a so-called act against the state. Importing matzoh was suddenly termed "ideological sabotage."

This information was recorded recently by the Synagogue Council of America, an eminently distinguished group with authoritative sources.

One shipping company sent as many as 5,000 packages. It is estimated that at least 15,000 packages in all, about 150,000 pounds of matzoh, was sent privately to individuals and groups in Russia. Except in only one case, Soviet authorities and customs officers have refused to free the matzoh for delivery.

This is but one more incident in the train of subterfuge evidenced in the last several months. We need to direct attention toward this continuing onslaught upon the fundamental human rights we seek for the world at large.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 954, introduced by my able and distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], which I am privileged to have cosponsored. The resolution calls upon our President to exert every effort at his command to facilitate the proper delivery of matzoh for the Feast of Passover in the Soviet Union. Time is short, Mr. Speaker, and I earnestly plead for House action on this resolution.

The necessity for concrete action grows more convincing with each day. At the same time we must, in long-range terms, achieve a universal condemnation of anti-Semitism, with effective enforcement, as a vehicle through which these ugly manifestations can be eradicated wherever they arise.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, 22 of my 50 years have been spent in Congress. During this 22 years I have tried to help all our veterans, their widows and